

REGIS COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 05809747 8

BX
4668.15
G54
1850

BDO-0353

Regis College Library

15 ST. MARY STREET
TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA
M4Y 2R5

2247
Conversion
FACTS

AND

CORRESPONDENCE

RELATING TO THE

ADMISSION INTO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

OF

VISCOUNT AND VISCOUNTESS FEILDING.

COLL. CHRISTIANITY
DE. MARY
TORONTO

BY THE

RIGHT REVEREND BISHOP GILLIS.

EDINBURGH:

CHARLES DOLMAN, 13 SOUTH HANOVER STREET;

AND 61 NEW BOND STREET, LONDON.

1850.

12,608



INTRODUCTION.

A series of letters now appearing in the columns of the "Morning Herald," by the Rev. Joseph Baylee, Principal of St Aidan's College, Birkenhead, obliges me to give to the following documents a character of publicity, which, in as far, at least, as depended upon me, they would never otherwise have possessed. As some introduction seems called for, to render intelligible to the general reader their origin and connexion, I may preface them as follows.

They were called into existence on occasion of the admission into the Catholic Church of a noble Lord and his Lady, whose abjuration of Anglican Protestantism I received within the Chapel of St Margaret's Convent, Edinburgh, on the 28th of August last, and whose names I now find myself at liberty to mention, Viscount and Viscountess Feilding. In the course of the same day, I was informed by Lord Feilding that his father, the Earl of —, his sister, Lady M —, and the Chaplain of the family, the above-named Mr Baylee, had arrived in Edinburgh, and expressed an earnest wish that a meeting should take place at my own residence, of all the parties interested in the matter. I, of course, assented to the request, and we met on the following morning, at ten o'clock, when, to the best of my recollection, our interview lasted rather more than three hours.

On the company being seated, after a few moments of silence, I addressed myself to the Earl of — begging to express my deep sympathy for what I knew must be his Lordship's painful feelings on the occasion

that had thus brought us together ; and requesting permission to ask Lord Feilding, in his father's presence, whether anything had been said or done by me, to bias in the very slightest degree the determination to which his Lordship had come, of submitting to the authority of the Catholic Church. The noble Earl immediately assured me that any such question was altogether unnecessary, as he attached no blame whatever to me ; but, that, as his son had communicated to him a written statement of reasons which had weighed with him in the step he had taken, he wished to have those reasons deliberately entered upon, and examined ; for which purpose he had availed himself of the presence and assistance of his friend and Chaplain, the Rev. Mr Baylee. The statement alluded to was then asked for, and produced ; and a request was made for pens, ink, and paper. These were also provided ; when, not deeming it courteous in my own house, to assume so very formal an attitude towards those who had done me the honour to wait upon me, I sat with folded arms to listen to Mr Baylee, as he proceeded to read Lord Feilding's reasons.

In reference to this document, Mr Baylee says, in his first letter to the "Herald," that he had entreated Lord Feilding to procure an interview between us, "in order to examine the correctness of the paper of 'Reasons for Catholicity,' which he had sent to his family, as the ground of the step which he had taken." The accuracy of this assertion I am nowise inclined to impugn ; but in justice to myself I must be permitted to say, that so little had I understood this to be the explicit object of the meeting asked for, that I had never even once perused the paper in question,—a circumstance not very likely to have occurred, had I really been aware of Mr Baylee's intentions, as here described. Lord Feilding had simply read to me, on

the previous evening, the beginning of a paper which he said he had drawn up and sent to his father, and which I requested he would be kind enough to leave with me, as my time was so little my own at the moment, that it was absolutely impossible for me to give it immediate attention. His Lordship did so, and we parted. I then returned to the consideration of other matters, which so continued to absorb my mind, that not only was I unable to bestow any leisure upon the paper left with me ; but that it actually got mislaid among other documents upon my table, till within a few minutes of the opening of our conference. Such was the paper on which Mr Baylee now entered, of which he had already taken notes, and which he went on composedly to analyse, taking fresh notes by the way ; addressing himself alternately to the Earl of — and to Lord Feilding, and bestowing an occasional look or question upon me ; till a whole hour, or nearly so, had been spent in its dissection.

Seeing Mr Baylee disposed to make the most of one or two oversights which had escaped the writer ; and, in order to prevent, if possible, the time being taken up with the discussion of points of secondary importance, I observed, that there were inaccuracies in the paper Mr Baylee was reading, for which I could not, of course, be expected to hold myself answerable, as I had had no hand whatsoever in drawing it up ; but, in as far as I was at all called upon to take part in the present conference, I begged to insist that, since Mr Baylee himself had remarked that the whole “ gist ” of Lord Feilding’s argument lay in the question of the infallibility of the Church, it would better suit the purpose to come at once to that question, on which all the rest depended ; than to waste any more words on what was not likely to lead to any satisfactory conclusion. Notwithstanding my repeated endeavours

to induce the consideration of this cardinal point, Mr Baylee so perseveringly adhered to the turn he had previously given to the interview, that, half-rising from my seat, I at length felt compelled to say to the Earl of —, that if the present conversation were intended to be one exclusively carried on between Mr Baylee, Lord Feilding, and his noble relatives, or one in which I was not to be allowed to take any part; they were most welcome to the apartment they now occupied, as long as might suit their convenience: but that, unless I were permitted to enter on the line of argument I had before suggested, I hoped they would excuse me for withdrawing; as I had other duties urgently claiming my attention, and which did not allow of my remaining any longer a mere listener to what was being said.

It was then, only, that, on the Earl of — signifying his assent, Mr Baylee laid upon the table the above mentioned paper, agreeing to set it altogether aside in as far as *I* was concerned; and clenching unmistakeably the final nature of the agreement, by the more “solemn” than warranted admonition addressed to Lord Feilding at the time, and since recorded by Mr Baylee, in his second letter to the “Herald,” that the important step his Lordship had taken, “he had taken upon inaccuracies.” At this juncture it was that Mr Baylee’s conference with *me* in reality began.

The question of Infallibility was now fairly entered upon, and, together with several others of minor consequence, which naturally or accidentally grew out of the discussion, continued to occupy us for about two additional hours. Perceiving, however, that, owing to the necessary want of preliminary arrangement, as well as to the absence of authoritative documents of reference, the discussion had to a great measure resolved itself into mere assertions and denials, carrying with them no further weight than what

might be conceded to them on either side, from previous conviction on the questions at issue; I moved the desirableness of its being brought to a close: adding, that, if his Lordship would allow me, I would forward to the Earl of —— a Catholic exposition of the different points to which allusion had been made, in the course of my controversy with Mr Baylee. The offer was apparently graciously accepted, and the conference broke up, all parties politely thanking me for the time I had devoted to it.

Mr Baylee having pressed the suggestion of a controversial correspondence, I gave him clearly to understand that the every-day claims upon my time were such, as to make it altogether impossible for me to engage in this duty; that all I could promise was a written statement of Catholic teaching in reference to the points already discussed between us, and that there I must leave the matter. On being asked if no other bishop or priest could be found to undertake the task, I named Dr Husenbeth, as one who, besides being perfectly qualified for the work, might possibly be able to command sufficient leisure; but, that as to the latter point, I really could not take upon me to speak with certainty of any one.

My distinguished visitors had now left me; and, after carefully recalling to mind all that had passed, I noted down, to the best of my ability, the heads of the discussion, and subsequently appealed to Lord Feilding for their correctness. From various reasons, some of which I had already explained before the close of the conference, three weeks were necessarily allowed to elapse, before I could set pen to paper upon the subject. The matter I had to treat of having afterwards grown upon my hands, to an extent that rendered the multiplying of written copies as undesirable, as it was to me, under the circumstances, impossible of execution,

I proposed to Lord Feilding, who was still in Edinburgh, to print the document, though not for publication. His Lordship having assented to the proposal, fifty copies of the "REVIEW," here for the first time *published*, were thrown off, three of which were forwarded to the Earl of —, one being directed to Lady M——, and one to the Rev. Mr Baylee, along with the following letter from myself to the noble Earl.

" MY LORD,

" I deeply regret that circumstances over which I had no command, have made it altogether impossible for me to fulfil sooner the promise I made to your Lordship on the 29th of August last. I now beg to forward to your Lordship, a Review of the different subjects touched upon in the course of my conversation with the Rev. Mr Baylee, on that day. My reason for presenting what I had to say in a printed form, rather than in writing, is two-fold: to render the task of reading less irksome, and the more easily to multiply the number of copies that may be required. The enclosed, though printed, is of course not published. The proofs have all been destroyed by my own hand; nor does there exist at this moment, with the exception of the three now forwarded, one single copy of it that is not under the control of Lord Feilding. It bears the date of the day on which the manuscript was first put into the printer's hands; nor can I charge myself with any degree of negligence in not having endeavoured to hasten the provokingly slow progress of the printing.

" Pray, accept, my Lord, the expression of my unfeigned regret, should the delay that has occurred have proved in any way a source of pain to your Lordship, and believe how sincerely and earnestly my unworthy prayers are offered up to God for those whose religious convictions, however honest in themselves, are yet such, as imperatively to call upon me for a proof that they are in truth unfounded.

" I have the honour to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's

Most obedient humble Servant in Christ,

✠ JAMES GILLIS,

Coadjutor Catholic Bishop, Edinburgh.

Edin. 2nd Nov. 1850.

The RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF —."

This letter, together with the facts of the preceding narrative, leave no doubt as to the nature of what I had declined to undertake, or bound myself to perform, in reference to the noble Earl, or to his Reverend friend and chaplain. The latter had urged me to enter with him on a controversial correspondence; a proposal, which, for reasons already stated, I had, positively, and in a final manner, refused to entertain: and, having no power to command the services of any third party, as my representative in the matter, I evidently *could not* have promised that any such would be forthcoming, as the opponent longed for by Mr Baylee. Being unable, therefore, to gratify the Reverend Gentleman with the expectation of any further controversial wrangling, I parted with him in the belief, that all connexion between us regarding the conference, was necessarily at an end. To the Earl of —, again, I had promised, certainly not a detailed account of all that had been spoken at the conference, but a Catholic summary of the various subjects touched upon during the discussion, in as far as I had been mixed up with it. I redeemed that promise, by transmitting to his Lordship the document to which the above letter refers; and, having received from Lord Feilding repeated written assurances, that I had done so faithfully, and to his entire satisfaction, I naturally held that my province of action in this hitherto exclusively family affair, was with all parties closed.

Not so, however, the Reverend Mr Baylee; who, to use his own high sounding phraseology, feels *compelled*, it seems, “to address me through the public press, and to bring the doctrines which I uphold, and the line of conduct which I and those who act with me, have chosen to pursue, to the bar of public opinion.” Of the *compulsion* he is suffering from,

something will be found in the Appendix. Meanwhile, whatever amount of polemical fame may result from this initiatory step in the way of publicity, the Reverend Principal of St Aidan's is all the more welcome to, that he may possibly feel more at home than I would do, in attempting to justify the proceeding of soliciting conferences on religious subjects in private houses, with the view of subsequently transferring their details, *without permission*, to the columns of a newspaper. Since, then, the Rev. Mr Baylee has taken upon himself to break enclosure, and somewhat rudely forced, what previous entreaty had failed to obtain; with the assent of Lord Feilding, I beg to submit the following pages to the judgment of the public.

Mr Baylee has complained that my communication to his noble patron, headed "A Review," &c., does not embody a correct summary of the subjects discussed between us. To show how far this complaint is well grounded, I am fortunately enabled to print from Mr Baylee's own handwriting, what *his* impressions were of the conference in question, when as yet there existed no necessity for getting up a case in the "Morning Herald." His more recent recollections, as now ingeniously marshalled in the flying sheets of that journal, will be noticed in the concluding letter of the present publication; where the reader will also find Lord Feilding's appreciation of our respective claims to correctness, as well as the unequivocal expression of his Lordship's opinion as to the value of the arguments adduced on either side, in the course of the present controversy.

The following argument on "Infallibility," by the Rev. Mr Baylee, is here printed, as affording irrefragable proof of the nature of that Reverend Gentleman's first reminiscences in reference to the Conference, of which he would now have it appear that my summary is an unfaithful record. My own pamphlet, "A Review," &c., was written simply as a Catholic statement of the subjects touched upon between Mr Baylee and myself in the course of our conversation; not as an answer to this paper, of which I did not feel called upon to take any special notice. Now, however, that circumstances render its publication desirable, I cannot, of course, allow it to go forth without comment, where silence on my part might possibly be misconstrued, and hence the foot notes which I have taken upon me to append to it. Anything requiring refutation, and unREFERRED to in these notes, will be found treated of in the "Review."

“ I drew up a paper on infallibility, giving a statement of the arguments pro-
 “ pounded by you at our conference, with the replies that I had given,
 “ and a great many Scripture references. That paper was sent to
 “ Lord —, on the 3rd of September, and I have his Lordship’s letter
 “ telling me that he sent it without delay to you, adding, that you had
 “ promised to answer and confute all the arguments which I had em-
 “ ployed on the 29th of August.” — (*See Mr Baylee’s second letter*
to the Morning Herald, 23rd Nov. 1850.)

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.*

THE question of the INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH is one of primary importance in the Romish controversy, for if the Church be infallible, her decisions ought to be received without dispute.

The question of the Infallibility of the Catholic Church must not, however, be confounded with that of the Infallibility of the Roman Church.

I shall therefore treat these two questions in separate papers, for greater distinctness. In dealing with a Romanist it is important to do so, because he usually assumes that to prove the infallibility of the Church Catholic, is to prove the infallibility of the Roman branch of it. By treating the two questions concurrently, I shall be able to keep continually before your mind this distinction, which you must feel to be all-important.† In this paper, then, I begin with the Infallibility of the Catholic Church. In doing so, I shall treat the question in the following order:—

* The paper alluded to by Mr Baylee. The Italics are the writer’s own.

† [This distinction would indeed be, as Mr Baylee calls it, “ all important in his dealing with a Romanist,” if he, Mr Baylee, really did admit the existence of any such thing as “ the infallibility of the Church Catholic,” in contradistinction to the asserted “ infallibility of what he terms the Roman branch of it;” but, as he immediately proceeds to inform his readers, that the Anglican Church of which he is a minister, denies the infallibility even of the Church Catholic; his “ all important distinction” dwindles at once into a set of empty words,—a phrase void of all meaning.]

1. Infallibility is not to be confounded with authority.
2. Is there a necessity for an infallible Church?
3. Has Christ promised infallibility to his Church?
4. Is it predicted that she was to be fallible?

First, then, infallibility is not to be confounded with authority.

The Anglican Church gladly admits the *authority* of the Catholic Church, while she denies her *infallibility*.

Art. 20. "The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith."*

Art. 21. "General Councils may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God."

We not only gladly acknowledge the authority of the Catholic Church, but we have not departed from her voice in a single matter of faith or commanded discipline.

I ask for one single instance in which we have done so.

If this cannot be proved, how great is the peril of any one who separates from our communion, and how great the guilt of the Bishop of Rome in sending priests here to make a schism.

Let me entreat you to demand a full and satisfactory answer to this question. It involves the question, Whether you are not at this moment in heresy and schism?†

Secondly, Is there a necessity for an infallible Church?

Bishop Gillis asserted that there is, upon the following grounds:—

* [Of what ultimate value "in controversies of faith," can that "authority" be, which is liable to err?]

† [*Heresy* and *schism* are imaginary delinquencies, mere idle sounds, apart from the pre-existence of infallible teaching, without which there can be no unity.]

1. It is necessary to salvation that a person should believe the doctrines of revealed religion—the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, &c.

2. These can only be known by revelation.

3. Except the witness to that revelation be infallible, the testimony would be without any value.

Therefore, Dr Gillis argued, there must be an infallible Church.

To this I replied:—

1. It is not necessary to salvation in all cases to believe the doctrines of revealed religion. For example, whatever may be anybody's opinion respecting the salvation of the heathen, or of heretics, or of unbaptized children, nobody doubts that baptized children who die in infancy are saved. And if they are saved by the application of the merits of Christ and the renewing grace of the Holy Spirit, without the intellectual knowledge of either the one or the other of these Blessed Persons, it follows, as an undeniable consequence, that the knowledge of the doctrines of revealed religion is not essential to salvation.

The Bishop replied, that infants were incapable of intelligence or faith, and therefore could not be responsible for believing or understanding revealed dogmas.

I answered, that the same principle was applicable to the case of all men. It might be expressed thus: that God would hold all men responsible for the opportunities of knowledge and faith granted to them, and for no more; and that therefore the argument, from necessity, for an infallible Church, fell to the ground.

The next point urged by the Bishop was, that the testimony of a witness to the doctrines of revelation would be useless, except he were infallible.

To this I replied, that a revelation from God must necessarily be infallible, but that this did not involve the necessity of an infallible expositor. For example,

the Jews were declared to be God's witnesses, and yet they were very fallible.

The Bishop asked me where they are so declared to be.*

I referred to Isaiah xliii. 10. "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen; that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no Saviour." See also chap. xliv. 8.

Would it follow that the Jewish witness is of no value, because the Jews became idolatrous?

I then took up the argument from necessity, thus:—

1. An argument, from the nature of things, must be as applicable to one dispensation as to another.

2. The nature of God has not changed; the nature of man has not changed; the relation of man to God has not changed.

3. Therefore, whatever necessity now exists for an infallible Church, must have equally existed before the coming of Christ.

4. But the Jewish Church was fallible, and did fail. It was the Jewish Church which crucified the Son of God.

If therefore man's nature and wants were the same before Christ's coming as they have been since, and that an Infallible Church was not needed then, neither is it now.

To this the Bishop answered, that the dispensation had changed.†

* [The Bishop asked where the Jewish Church was declared to be a fallible Church?]

† [This unmeaning answer attributed to me by Mr Baylee, arose, I am all the more willing to believe, out of an honest misconception on his part of what I *had* said, that the real tenor of my argument is made abundantly evident from what here immediately follows; since, on Mr Baylee's own showing, I

I replied, that this was shifting the ground from the nature of things to the circumstances of dispensations ; that if he wished to give up the ground of necessity, and to discuss the difference of dispensations, I was prepared to do so ; but that I would not consent to confuse the question, by taking two grounds at once. When I continued to press this upon the Bishop, he called upon me to prove that the Jewish Church was fallible. He asserted that there was a necessity for her rejecting Christ, in order to man's redemption ; but that her falling immediately before her close, for a special purpose, did not prove her not to have been infallible up to that time.

I replied, that the Jewish Church actually erred in all periods of her history ; that her captivity was in consequence of her mixing up idolatry with God's worship, as well as for the grossest immorality and profaneness amongst her priests and prophets.

The Bishop called upon me to prove this, allowing an appeal to the Bible as simple history, and, as such, authentic. I did so thus :

1. The Jewish Church was God's Church, with a priesthood who were the authorized instructors of the people.

2. They had the power of life and death over those who refused to receive their teaching, or to obey their decisions.

3. Yet they corrupted God's truth, and misled the people.

The first assertion is proved from the prophet Malachi :—" My covenant was with him (Levi) of life and peace ; and I gave them to him for the fear

continued to insist on there having existed before Christ's coming, the same necessity for an infallible Church, that there is now ; and hence, contended for the infallibility of the Jewish Church, which he had denied, challenging him at the time to a proof of the contrary.]

wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips; he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity. For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts," chap. ii. 5—7.

Here, then, was a Church and a priesthood, the divine authority of which could not be fairly disputed. That they had the power of life and death over those who refused to submit to their decisions, is proved from Deut. xvii. 8—13. "If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, being matters of controversy within thy gates; then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God shall choose; and thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire; and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment. And thou shalt do according to the sentence which they of that place which the Lord shall choose, shall show thee; and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee; according to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do; thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee, to the right hand, nor to the left. And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die; and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel. And all the people shall hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously."

Surely there is here as solemnly sanctioned an authority as any that is sanctioned in the New

Testament ; yet that very priesthood corrupted God's truth, and misled the people.

In proof of this, let us turn to various passages of Scripture.

Mal. ii. 8, 9. "But ye are departed out of the way ; ye have caused many to stumble at the law ; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law."

Ezek. xxxiv. 2, 18, 19. "Son of man, prophesy against the shepherds of Israel, prophesy, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God unto the shepherds, woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves ! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks ? Seemeth it a small thing unto you to have eaten up the good pasture, but ye must tread down with your feet the residue of your pastures ? and to have drunk of the deep waters, but ye must foul the residue with your feet ? And as for my flock, they eat that which ye have trodden with your feet ; and they drink that which ye have fouled with your feet."

Jer. xxiii. 11, 14. "For both prophet and priest are profane ; yea, IN MY HOUSE have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord. I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem an horrible thing : they commit adultery, and walk in lies : they strengthen also the hand of evil-doers, that none doth return from his wickedness : they are all of them unto me as Sodom, and the inhabitants thereof as Gomorrah."

Jer. viii. 8, 9. "How do ye say, We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us ? Lo, certainly in vain made he it ; the pen of the scribes is in vain. The wise men are ashamed, they are dismayed and taken : lo, they have rejected the word of the Lord ; and what wisdom is in them ?"

Jer. v. 30, 31. "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land ; the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means ; and my people love to have it so : and what will ye do in the end thereof?"

Isa. ix. 16. "For the leaders of this people cause them to err ; and they that are led of them are destroyed."

After some effort to escape the force of those testimonies, the overwhelming amount of evidence compelled the Bishop to acknowledge that the Jewish priesthood had corrupted the truth, and misled the people ;* but that there was a remedy provided in the prophets.

I showed that the prophets are equally denounced in those passages, and in a multitude of similar ones ; that *occasionally* faithful prophets were raised up ; but that this only proved the fallibility of the Church, which rejected their testimony, and put the prophets themselves to death.—See Mat. xxi. 33—46 ; and xxiii. 37 ; Acts vii. 52.†

The Bishop asked me, Did I mean to deny that the prophetic Scriptures were infallible ?

I answered, that the word of the Lord by the prophets is infallible, but that those prophets who wrote by inspiration, did not understand their own words, and therefore could not expound them infallibly.

* [This is incorrect. What the Bishop acknowledged, was, that the Jewish priests had not unfrequently failed in their conduct ; but that the Jewish people had never, in consequence, been exposed to the danger of being misled in regard to the Mosaic revelation, without a remedy having been provided, in the extraordinary mission of the prophets.]

† [If "*occasionally*" be here meant to imply of rare occurrence, Mr Baylee's assertion is contradicted by the whole tenor of the Biblical narrative ; while, in point of teaching and conduct, the Jewish Church and the Jewish people were never more blameless than during the period that elapsed between the last Prophet whose writings have come down to us, Malachi, and the advent of the Messiah.]

I reminded the Bishop that he had insensibly taken the Protestant ground, for that he was asserting simply the infallibility of the Scriptures.

The Bishop demanded a proof that the prophets did not understand their own words.

I referred him to 1 Pet. i. 9, 12. "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you : searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow : Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven ; which things the angels desire to look into."

This decisive passage left no room for discussion.* It determines that the prophets were not infallible expounders of revelation, inasmuch as they did not understand it.

It is the more instructive, because it is not speaking of dark ceremonies, but of the sufferings of Christ and of his subsequent glory.

The Bishop asked me, Did not the Old Testament Scriptures infallibly teach about the atonement of Christ?

I reminded him again, that this was Protestant ground ; that we were not discussing about an infallible revelation, but about an infallible expositor. I asserted that not one Jew ever learned from the word of

* [Mr Baylee had, no doubt, forgotten that I rejected at the time the interpretation he had put on the above passage of St Peter, telling him that here again, as in the previously cited text from the 2nd ch. of Malachi, the meaning he had given to the words of Scripture was but "a fond imagining of his own;" and hence to me no proof whatever of the fact he had been labouring to establish.]

God, or the teaching of the Church, the great cardinal doctrine of divine revelation, that the Messiah whom they looked for in glory, was to bear their sins, and so to make atonement for them.*

The Bishop asked me to prove this ; and I referred to the case of St Peter. Our blessed Lord declared him to be a blessed man, to whom his Heavenly Father had revealed the truth that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God. Yet at that moment St Peter was ignorant of the need of the Messiah's atonement, and would not believe it when Jesus declared it to him. Mat. xvi. 21—23.

I asked the Bishop, Could St Peter have been ignorant of the atonement, if the Church had expounded to him the 53d chapter of Isaiah? This overwhelming amount of evidence compelled the Bishop to change his ground. He said that the dispensation was different ; that we needed an infallible expositor now, although they did not then.†

To this I made two replies :—

1. That to allege a different dispensation, was to give up the ground of necessity, and to take up the Christian ground, to which I had no objection to go,

* [If this means anything, it means apparently, that, while the written revelation *did* teach the atonement *infallibly* ; the Jewish Church, its expositor, *did not* teach the same *infallibly*. Yet, in the very next line, Mr Baylee goes on to say, that neither the expositor, nor the “ Word of God ” itself, ever taught a single Jew “ this great cardinal doctrine of Divine revelation ! ” One thing, however, is clear from the above ; the Bishop is here still understood by Mr Baylee to be contending for the infallibility of the Jewish Church as the expositor of the Mosaic revelation.]

† [The ground taken from the beginning by the Bishop, on which to build the necessity of infallible teaching in reference to a Divine revelation, being, as Mr Baylee acknowledges, (page xiv.) the ground of common sense ; he could not have delivered himself of the palpable absurdity here chronicled by Mr Baylee, since the claims of common sense must evidently remain the same, under all possible dispensations. The Bishop's real line of argument will be found in his own statement of it.]

provided he would admit that I had disproved the necessity of an infallible tribunal.

2. That the dispensations were not essentially different; that there might be a diversity in rites or ceremonies, but that the essentials of the dispensations were the same.

When the Bishop hesitated to admit this, I asked him to give me a single dogma of the Christian religion, which was not contained in the Old Testament. He referred to the Trinity and the Incarnation.* I quoted Isa. xlviii. 16. "Come ye near unto me, hear ye this : I have not spoken in secret from the beginning ; from the time that it was, there am I : and now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me."

And Isa. ix. 6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder ; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

The Bishop said "That does not bring conviction to my mind." It did to the mind of St Athanasius, I replied ; and demanded which of us was the true Catholic, I who took the same view of Holy Scripture as St Athanasius, or he who denied its power to bring conviction to his mind ?

I then pressed again upon the Bishop to name a single dogma of the Christian religion, which was not in the Old Testament. He said I could not convert a Jew upon my principles. I answered that the best reply was, that I had converted a Jew, without once referring to the New Testament, and that he was now Chaplain to the Germans in Liverpool. He asked

* [The Bishop *did not* refer to the *incarnation*. In the absence of any other proof, let the reader notice the utter want of connexion, caused by the introduction of the second text from Isaiah, "Unto us a child is born," between Mr Baylee's mention of St Athanasius, and the first words of the prophet, to which alone it bears reference.]

me, how I could prove out of the Old Testament that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, when he was not born in Old Testament times ?

I replied, Moses, Isaiah, and Daniel had the same religion. Moses taught the Jews that a goat was to bear their sins, Lev. xvi. 20—30. Isaiah taught that “a man of sorrows” was to bear their sins, Isa. liii. 3, 6, 10. Daniel taught that that man was to be the Messiah who was to be cut off, in order to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, Dan. ix. 24, 26.

These three passages, therefore, either teach two religions, two methods of atonement for sin, or the types and ceremonies of the Levitical dispensation point to a suffering Messiah, who was to atone for sin.

Farther, the same chapter in Daniel declared that this was to take place before the destruction of Jerusalem, ver. 26, 27.

Messiah must therefore have come, and been cut off.

I declared that God had enabled me to bring conviction to the minds of many Jews, by these and similar proofs.

Our conversation embraced for a few minutes at a time, some other desultory subjects, which will come into other papers.* This was the whole of the argument for infallibility upon the ground of necessity.

I shall briefly sum it up.

1. Under all dispensations, man has been the same ; God has been the same ; man’s relation to God as creature and Creator, and as sinner to his Supreme Judge, has been the same.

2. Therefore if men could not be saved now without the help of an infallible expositor of Divine revelation, neither could they then.

* Up to the appearance of Mr Baylee’s first letter in the MORNING HERALD, no other papers did come, or, they would have been inserted here.

3. But they were saved then without such help, for neither prophet nor priest could expound a revelation which they did not understand.

4. The Jewish Church was at all periods of her history, fallible, and was continually falling from God, and corrupting his truth.

I send you these thoughts, with the earnest prayer and hope, that you will diligently and prayerfully ponder them. You will, no doubt, obtain the best assistance which the Church of Rome has to offer you. I rejoice greatly in this, for I most earnestly desire that you should sift the subject to the bottom. I beg also to remind you of what I have stated in an early part of the paper :—

The Church of England has not rejected one doctrine, or discarded the discipline enforced by the Catholic Church.

Those therefore who separate from her communion upon doctrinal grounds, are guilty of heresy and schism.

May God give you the light and grace of his own most Blessed Spirit.

JOSEPH BAYLEE.

*St Aidan's,
Birkenhead, 2d Sept. 1850.*

A REVIEW
OF
THE SUBJECTS TOUCHED UPON DURING A
CONTROVERSIAL CONVERSATION,

HELD AT EDINBURGH, IN PRESENCE OF

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE EARL OF ———;

ON THE 29TH OF AUGUST, 1850.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND BISHOP GILLIS.

(Not Published.)

EDINBURGH: M.DCCC.L.

MY LORD,

I avail myself of my first opportunity of leisure, to redeem the promise I made to your Lordship some weeks ago, of forwarding to you a statement of the doctrine taught by the Catholic Church on the several points of which mention was made in the course of my late controversial interview with your Lordship, Lady M * * *, and the Rev. Mr Baylee. I was the only one who on that occasion used neither pen nor pencil ; but, on the breaking up of the conference, I took note, to the best of my recollection, of all that had passed, and submitted my jottings at the time to Lord Feilding, who pronounced them to be correct. By these shall I now be guided.

The first point of Catholic belief challenged by Mr Baylee, was the Supremacy of St Peter, and his presidency over the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem.

I observed, that I believed in the Supremacy of St Peter on other grounds than the mere narrative of that council by St Luke, and that, being once satisfied as to the fact of that Supremacy, the above narrative conveyed to me the clear conviction that St Peter had really presided over the council of the Apostles, and ranked there before St James, the bishop of Jerusalem.

On Mr Baylee referring for the contrary to the proceedings of the council, as recorded in the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, I remarked, that it would be allowing him an unfair advantage, to permit him to argue at all from the words of Scripture, until he had proved it to be the word of God, which I asserted it was impossible for him to do conclusively,

on any but Catholic grounds ; and that I was hence entitled to ask him, as if I had been an infidel, to prove, in the first instance, the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures.

This Mr Baylee did not attempt to do, observing simply, that I could not refuse to admit the *historical* value of the narrative.

The conversation having now taken a desultory turn, in which reference was again made to the Supremacy of St Peter, I insisted on our setting aside altogether the consideration of that question, until we had first laid down the necessary ground-work of infallible authority in doctrinal teaching, Mr Baylee himself admitting that to be “the gist” of the whole argument ; and because it would be time enough to inquire into the outward organ of said authority, when previously satisfied of the necessity of its existence.

I then proceeded to state, that the truths and facts which form the basis of a Christian’s belief being of such a nature that no amount of human learning, nor any process of human reason, could ever lead to their discovery, they must, if known at all to man, have been revealed to him by the Almighty.

This much Mr Baylee readily granted.

I added,—now, as none of these truths or facts have ever been revealed by the Almighty *to me individually*, they can only become known to me through the evidence of some visible and audible witness, on whose testimony I must of necessity receive them.

To this second proposition Mr Baylee also assented.

But, I continued, ere such a witness can ever be to me a sufficient one, or, in other words, ere the evidence of this witness can be to me such, as to exclude all possibility of doubt on the score of its testimony, I must have the assurance that such a witness neither can be deceived itself, nor deceive.

The last of these premises Mr Baylee did not deny.

Therefore, I concluded, ere I can admit as absolutely certain the truths and facts which form the groundwork of a Christian's faith, I must of necessity receive them on the teaching of an *infallible witness*.

This infallible witness was to me not a book, which can carry with it no authority until I am satisfied that it is Divinely inspired, faithfully translated, and that I understand its true sense ; questions replete with difficulties for the most learned, and impossible of solution for nine-tenths of the human race ; but a visible teaching Church, of whose infallible authority I become certain, on the same grounds on which I rest my faith in the Divine nature of Christianity, viz.—on the heavenly mission of the Apostles, and on the legitimate succession of pastors who have inherited their commission ; the former proved by the miracles of Christ and of the apostles themselves, their virtues, their martyrdom, and their success ; the latter, a matter of public notoriety, through the medium of ordination.

Although urged once and again to say *yes* or *no* to the conclusion I had drawn, as to the necessary existence of an infallible teaching authority in matters of Christian faith, ere anything like rational certainty can exist as to what a Christian is called upon to believe, Mr Baylee *cautiously abstained from any such positive reply* ; but waived the difficulty, by saying : “ Allow me to speak, and I will answer that.” I too leniently permitted him to take his own way ; when, feeling himself freed from the inconvenient alternative, he proceeded as follows, to argue from analogy.

Your argument, said he, is one of common sense, and therefore, as good for a Jew as for a Christian. Now, the Jews had *sufficient* means of knowing certainly the revelation which God had made to them ; yet

they had no *infallible means*. Hence, your argument proves nothing.

As a whole, I positively denied the second of Mr Baylee's premises, and maintained, on the contrary, that the Jews *had infallible teaching*, viz. the revealed law of Moses, as borne witness to by the ordinary ministry of the Jewish Church, and by the extraordinary ministry of the prophets. Here again, I unnecessarily relieved Mr Baylee for the moment, from the burden of his argument; for having denied his premiss, it was his business to prove it, not mine to prove the reverse.

Mr Baylee then undertook to make good his assertion, by referring to the first eight verses of the second chapter of Malachi, laying great stress on the words, "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law from his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts. But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts. Therefore have I made you also contemptible, and base before the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law." From the above, Mr Baylee inferred that the Jewish priesthood had corrupted the nature of the Mosaic revelation confided to their trust, the true interpretation of which ought to have been sought from their mouth.

Now, as I observed at the time, the above passage, not only does not prove the correctness of Mr Baylee's assertion,—that the Jews were, in the days of Malachi, without *infallible* guidance in matters of faith:—but it actually proved its untruth.

The only "covenant" for which infallible guidance could have been required among the Jews, was the general Mosaic revelation, embracing the deposit

of the promises and prophecies, the moral law, the ceremonial precepts, and the typical rites of religious worship. This, then, is *the* "covenant," which it rests with Mr Baylee to prove, that the Jewish priesthood had corrupted in the days of Malachi. To prove anything short of this, is to prove nothing to the purpose. Yet Mr Baylee's only proof of this in the above quotation, are the words, "ye have corrupted *the covenant*." This is very like proving the obligation of keeping holy the *first* day of the week by denominating it "*the Sabbath*," and then, referring to the fifth of Deuteronomy, "Keep *the Sabbath-day* to sanctify it,"—the "*Sabbath*" of Deuteronomy being the seventh day of the week, (our Saturday,) and the Christian "*Sabbath*" being the first day of the week, (our Sunday.) So argues Mr Baylee. He takes violent possession of the word "*covenant*," and then gives to that word a totally different meaning from the sense which evidently belongs to it in the text of his own choosing.

When the prophet says that the people should "seek THE LAW at the mouth of the priest;" or again, that the priests have by their conduct, "caused many to stumble at THE LAW;" he evidently speaks of the Mosaic revelation generally.—But when he adds: "Ye have *corrupted the covenant*," he, in the first place used in Hebrew a mode of speech, which the Septuagint has translated, *διεφθίγατε*, and the Vulgate, "irritum fecistis;" "*to violate, to make void*;" while the word "*covenant*," applies no longer to the general revelation, but to the special pact which God had made with the sacerdotal house of Levi, and in virtue of which the children of Levi were to enjoy certain exclusive privileges, on condition of their fulfilling particular duties, and being bound by the observance of a peculiar code of disciplinary laws. Hence the prophet distinctly qualifies the word *covenant*, by

calling it the "COVENANT OF LEVI." Indeed, this is made clear beyond the shadow of doubt, by the whole context of the prophecy; for, whereas the prophet's words from the beginning of the first chapter, are addressed to the people of Israel generally:—"The burden of the word of the Lord to *Israel* by Malachi;" they are from the seventh verse of the same chapter, restricted in a special manner *to the priests*; a circumstance emphatically insisted upon from the first verse of the second chapter. "And now, O ye PRIESTS, this commandment is for YOU;" and the only "covenant" mentioned in the following seven verses, is that which the Almighty had entered into with the house of Levi, and which the Jewish priests are reproached by the prophet for having violated, or made void, in as far as having neglected to fulfil THEIR part of it, they deserved that the Almighty should no longer be bound by His. They had done this, however, not by adulterating the revelation of Moses, but by swerving in their daily conduct from the example left to them by Levi; by departing from the fulfilment of the peculiar obligations binding upon them personally as priests, and through the scandal of their lives, causing many to fall away from the practice of what they knew to be their duty; as the two sons of Eli had done before them, in the days of Samuel, (1st Sam. chap. ii., ver. 27, &c.)

To have corrupted the general Mosaic revelation in the sense which Mr Baylee meant to convey by his inadmissible interpretation of the word "COVENANT," they must have added to, or taken from the promises made; or falsified the prophecies; or adulterated the moral law; or suppressed or altered the nature of the typical rites and sacrifices; of which delinquencies the Jewish priesthood as a body, can never be shown to have been guilty.

The above passage, therefore, does not prove the

truth of Mr Baylee's assertion, that the Jews were, in the time of Malachi, without infallible guidance in matters of faith ; but, if it proves anything, it proves the very contrary, for it lays down the distinct principle, that the Jewish priesthood were to be to the people the natural expounders of the Mosaic Law ; and that it was *the duty* of the people to seek the law at THEIR mouth, because they were the messengers of the Lord of hosts, or those sent to speak to the people in His name. How could such ever be *a duty* for the people, unless they had the assurance that they were not to be led astray ? That many of the Jewish priests had, in the days of Malachi, fallen away personally, from a correct performance of the obligations by which they were specially bound, as sons of Levi, is evident ; but it is not less so, that an extraordinary messenger was then sent to them, in the person of the Divinely inspired prophet Malachi, to rebuke them for their sins, and recall them to their duty, in order that God's covenant might still remain with the house of Levi.* It is impossible, in fact, to quote a single instance in which the Jewish priests are rebuked because of their personal misconduct, without instancing at the same time a Divinely inspired messenger, sent to God's people, in the person of a prophet, to watch over the deposit of the Mosaic revelation. "The prophets," says St Augustine, in his admirable work, *De Civitate Dei*, † "the prophets were "to the Israelites, their philosophers, their theologians, "their teachers, in the way of morals and of religion. Whoever sought wisdom from them, and lived

* The comment upon the fourth verse of the 2d chapter of Malachi in the quarto edition of the Protestant Bible, printed in 1802, and appointed to be read in churches, is the following :—Chap. ii. 4., "MY COVENANT." "So that my covenant may continue to be still with the tribe of Levi, and not be taken away for their misconduct."

† *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xviii. cap. 41.

“ according to their lessons, lived not on the lessons of men, but were wise according to God, who spoke through them.” The very fact, then, of the prophet Malachi having been sent to the Jewish people at the period in question, proves that they were not at that moment without *infallible* guidance.

Mr Baylee’s reply to this was, that the “ *words of prophecy*” were *alone infallible* ; not the prophets, who were mere “ *machines*,” not understanding their own words.

On my venturing to question this very sweeping assertion, Mr Baylee referred for his exclusive proof, to the 12th verse of the 1st chap. of the 1st Epistle of St Peter, “ Unto whom it was revealed, that *not unto themselves*, but *unto us*, they did minister the things,” &c.

The point to be proved here by Mr Baylee, be it observed, was, that the prophets were not *infallible guides* to the Jews, because they were mere “ *machines*,” who understood not their own words. The proof adduced was as follows. “ Of which salvation *the prophets* have *inquired*, and *sought diligently*, (mere “ *machines* !) who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you. *Searching* what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified before-hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.—(A vast amount of thinking here for *mere machines* !) “ *Unto whom it was revealed*, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you, by them that have preached the Gospel unto you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.”* That is to say, that because St Peter declares in so many words, that it had actually been revealed to the prophets that what they fore-

* 1 Pet. i. 10, 11, 12.

told of the future sufferings and triumphs of Christ was not to happen in their own time, but in that to which St Peter especially refers, to-wit, his own day, *therefore*, according to Mr Baylee, we are to hold the prophets as mere “machines,” who understood not their own words ;—a somewhat singular consequence to draw from the Apostle’s declaration, it must be admitted ; yet this was all Mr Baylee’s proof !*

It must here be kept in mind, that the mission of the prophets was generally twofold ; to add to the deposit of revelation, by foretelling future events bearing upon the same ; and to be the special messengers of God to his people, for comfort, for instruction, or for rebuke. In their former capacity, their announcements were, from the very nature of prophecy, necessarily veiled in a certain degree of obscurity ; and how far such obscurity may have in certain cases existed even for themselves, can only be at the present day matter of conjecture. But in their latter capacity of special messengers of God, sent to console, to instruct, or to rebuke his people, (and it is in this case, particularly, that they were *the guides* of that people,) to say that they were not *infallible guides*, is to deny their inspiration ; while, to maintain that they who were sent to direct others did not understand themselves, is to utter an assertion which no sane man can concede.

Mr Baylee, then, having failed to prove that the Jewish priesthood had corrupted *the general Mosaic revelation*, and that the prophets were not *infallible guides*, his argument from analogy falls to the ground ;

* The Protestant interpreter, Dr Macknight, infers from this passage of St Peter, that the prophets required to investigate the subject, before they discovered that their predictions did not refer to their own day, but to later times ; that is to say, the times of the Apostles. “ That not *concerning* themselves, but *concerning* us, they did minister,” &c. Dr Macknight, then, saw no evidence here of the prophets being (*in quantum* prophets,) mere unconscious specimens of human *machinery*.

and we return to the point from whence we started,—the argument of common sense.

That argument, said Mr Baylee, holds good for a Jew, as well as for a Christian. I grant it ; and for this very simple reason. It was as impossible for a Jew to have discovered through any merely human medium the subject matter of the Mosaic revelation, as it unquestionably is for a Christian to arrive at the knowledge of what he believes, through any amount of human learning, or in virtue of any effort of human reasoning. Therefore, unto both Jew and Christian was a Divine revelation equally necessary.—It was as impossible, again, for a Jew, in the time of Malachi, (I follow the chronology of the Protestant Bible,) to have come to the knowledge of any such Divine revelation, save on the evidence of some visible and audible witness, (unless indeed he had been personally inspired ;) as it was for an uninspired Christian of the 12th century, to have discovered the truths and facts of Christianity without the assistance of a similar witness.—Finally, it was as impossible for a Jew, in the days of Malachi, to be *absolutely certain* of the truths and facts on which he rested his faith, as it was for a Christian of the 12th century to be *absolutely certain* of the ground-work on which he rested his ; apart from the assurance on both sides, that they received the basis of their belief on the testimony of a witness who neither could be deceived nor deceive.

To the Jew, then, as to the Christian, *an infallible teaching authority* was alike indispensable ; and this is the common sense inference, which, after having granted the premises, Mr Baylee was bound either *to admit* or *to deny*, and from the admission or denial of which he so prudently abstained.—He could not *admit it* ; for then he must have yielded obedience to the Catholic Church. He could not *deny it* ; for it would have lain

with him, then, to have shown any other conclusion logically deducible from the premises already granted, and that was impossible. Mr Baylee therefore struck off at a tangent, to reason from analogy. Now, there being no real analogy in the case, but what must have told against him, as I have just proved, he strove to establish an hypothesis favourable to himself, by broaching two propositions, neither of which he has been able to make good; to-wit, that the ordinary ministry of the Jewish Church had corrupted the general Mosaic revelation, and that the prophets personally were not infallible; nay, far from adducing any proof of the above assertions, Mr Baylee has actually disproved them both, by the very scriptural references to which he appealed in their support.

Here, then, I hold, is an end of the argument, and my original position remains unrefuted. There is no sufficient means by which a Christian of the present day can be made certain of the ground-work of his belief, but through the testimony of an infallible witness—the next point to be proved, being, that the testimony of such a witness, can be no other than the authoritative teaching of an Infallible Church. As this last point, however, was not reached during the interview to which this paper refers, it need form no part of my present answer to Mr Baylee.

In connexion with his previous theory of the prophets not having understood their own words, Mr Baylee asserted, that they could not therefore expound infallibly, a revelation of the nature of which they were ignorant; and that, in point of fact, not one Jew ever learned from them, from their revelations, or from the teaching of the ordinary ministry of the Jewish Church, that the Messiah was to make atonement for their sins, or in his own person to suffer. Mr Baylee's proof was

that although St Peter had been declared a blessed man, to whom God had personally revealed that Christ was His living Son ; yet Peter was still ignorant of the necessity of an atonement ; witness his conduct when our Lord said unto him, "Get behind me, Satan," for having objected to his Master going up to Jerusalem to suffer and to be killed.

In answer to the above, it is necessary here to distinguish. What the Jews in general, or even St Peter, may have gathered from the prophets, their predictions, or the teaching of the ordinary ministry of the Jewish Church, concerning the acts of the Messiah, and the manner in which he was to redeem Israel, and the world, is one thing ; what the prophets, their prophecies, and the ordinary ministry of the Jewish Church, *really taught* concerning the Messiah, his character, his sufferings, his death, and the glory of his tomb, is another ; and it is into this latter fact, exclusively, that it can be legitimate to inquire, while discussing the infallible teaching of the prophets and of the Jewish Church.

Whatever may have been taught by the promises, prophecies, or figurative rites of the Jewish Church, respecting the sacrifice of the Messiah, it is clear to common sense, that, when the time arrived for the accomplishment of that sacrifice, and the atonement attached to it, it must have come upon the Jews in an altogether unexpected manner, or, it never could have come to pass at all. To this general rule of God's Providence there was no reason why St Peter should have been made an exception ; indeed, the reason was the other way, in as far as St Peter was one of those who were to figure unfavourably in his Master's passion. The degree of obscurity, then, which may have existed in the minds of the Jews, as to the Messiah's sacrifice and atonement, is no argument against the *infallible teaching* of the prophets, or of the ordinary ministry of

the Jewish Church respecting that same sacrifice and atonement : for the confusion which generally prevailed in the mind of the Jews between the spiritual glories of the Messiah and his temporal abasement, was the very means through which God's providential designs were finally to be worked out.

If Mr Baylee's argument be of any weight, then, against the infallibility of the prophets and of the Jewish Church, it is of equal weight against the infallibility of God's special teaching, in the very case of St Peter, to which Mr Baylee appeals. Did that revelation fail in the infallibility of its teaching, because, although it laid open to St Peter the fact of the incarnation, (*not its manner,*) it yet left him in ignorance of *the manner* of the redemption? No. Then why should the Mosaic revelation be said to have failed in its teachers, because, although they bore unquestionable evidence to the sacrifice of the Messiah and to its results, yet their teaching remained enveloped in that degree of obscurity which was the essential nature of a law of shadows, and the very medium appointed by Him from whom the Mosaic revelation proceeded, for the ultimate achievement of his own designs?—Whereas in one man the whole world had been cursed, and lost ; was there not in that revelation a distinct promise, that through one Man, and that Man of the seed of Abraham, all nations should be blessed and saved? Were there not prophecies distinctly foretelling that “this expected one of nations, this hope of Israel, was to be a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief, despised and rejected of men ; bearing our griefs, and carrying our sorrows ; a Messiah that “was to be cut off,” when the Jewish sacrifice should cease? a Messiah that was at once to be a priest and a victim? Was not the priesthood of the Jewish law a type, shadowing forth His priesthood? Were not all the sacrifices of the Jewish

law prefigurative of His sacrifice? And did not Caiphas, (the high priest of the Jewish Church at the very time of the sacrifice of the Messiah, and the last prophet of that Church), did *he* not, in *virtue of his office of high priest*, infallibly identify the Messiah with the “one “man whom it was expedient should die for the people, “that the whole nation perish not?” And this, says the evangelist, “he spake not of himself, but, being high “priest that year, *he prophesied* that Jesus should die “for that nation, and not for that nation only, but that “also He should gather together in one, the children of “God that were scattered abroad.”* Is not the doctrine of the atonement here infallibly borne witness to by the chief priest of the Jewish law? And does not an evangelist declare that it is so, by a man who speaks not of himself, but of God, and who so speaks because he is the high priest for the time being? Yet, what was the result of the prophecy in question? Although it in reality pointed out Christ as the Messiah of Israel; humanly speaking, it actually sealed his doom. “Then, from that day forth, they took counsel “together to put him to death.” Here, then, is a last and striking specimen of the true, yet mysterious teaching of a Church, whose nature and mission it was, if I may so express myself, to lead a carnal people so far with their eyes open, and so far blindfold, to the crib, and to the gibbet of the crucified Messiah. If Caiphas “spake not of himself,” as St John pointedly declares, he “*prophesied*,” or, in other words, he taught infallibly that Christ was the Messiah. Nor does it in the least affect the infallibility of such teaching, that as a practical sequence to it, the Pharisees sought from that day to put the Messiah to death. Neither, then, can any amount of obscurity in the mind of the Jews as to Christ’s sacrifice and atonement, reflect upon

* John xi. 49, 53.

the infallible teaching of the ordinary or extraordinary ministry of the Jewish Church.

To say, however, as Mr Baylee says, that not one Jew had ever learned from the Jewish Church that the Messiah was to bear their sins, and make atonement for them, is to indulge in an over wide assertion, considering what we read among others, of Simeon and Anna in the temple, when Mary, the mother of Jesus, brought her Son to Jerusalem, "to present him to the Lord;" and when Simeon, after having identified the Child with the Messiah, proclaimed that He would be set up "for a sign which shall be spoken against," and that a sword would pierce through his mother's soul. While Anna, too, "spake of Him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem." Now, as the evangelist declares that the Holy Ghost was upon Simeon, and that Anna was a prophetess, the probability is, that their words did not contradict each other, when they spake concerning the Messiah to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem; and hence, that as the one made open allusion to the future trials and sufferings of the Messiah, these future trials and sufferings were not unknown to, or, for all we can know to the contrary, unproclaimed by the other.

Finally, were there any truth in Mr Baylee's argument, it would go to stamp the whole of God's economy in the Mosaic revelation with absolute imbecility; for, according to Mr Baylee, *1stly*, the Jewish priesthood, five hundred years before the advent of the Messiah, had corrupted the covenant, meaning by that word, the general revelation of Moses, including the promises, prophecies, moral law, and typical and sacrificial rites. *2dly*, The prophets were *mere machines*, who did not understand their own words. *3rdly*, By a necessary consequence, they could not infallibly expound a revelation, of the nature of which they were ignorant.

4thly, Not one Jew had ever, through said salvation, arrived at the knowledge, not of the *manner* only, but of the *fact*, of an atonement by the Messiah. Then, in the name of common candour, to what child of Abraham could such a dispensation have ever been otherwise than utterly useless?—But this is landing in an inference that is absurd. Therefore, the premises that forcibly lead to it, are necessarily unsound.

After the foregoing unsuccessful attempts to build the principle of his theory against the infallibility of the Jewish Church, on the positive declarations of Holy Scripture, Mr Baylee proceeded to furnish an instance of its truth from the facts related in the 9th chapter of St John's Gospel. The man born blind whom Jesus had cured, was, said Mr Baylee, actually excommunicated by the Jewish Church; they had put him “out of the synagogue,” yet, Jesus received him into *His* all holy communion; therefore, added Mr Baylee, the Jewish Church was not to him an *infallible* guide.

In answer to this, let me, in the first place, observe, that before being entitled to the benefit of his inference from the above Gospel narrative, it must be clearly established for Mr Baylee, that the Pharisees mentioned in the 9th chapter of St John—“*They bring him to the Pharisees,*” (verse 13,)—fairly represented on the occasion in question, the authorities of the Jewish Church. Secondly, of what kind of excommunication it was here question, since it was customary among the Jews even for private individuals to excommunicate; and, lastly, that the vague expression “*the Jews,*” in the 22d verse, cannot be otherwise understood, than as of the religious teachers of the Jewish Church, or at least, as necessarily implying them. Into any of these questions, however, it is altogether unnecessary to enter at present, as, ere

the above quoted instance of the *non-infallibility* of the Jewish Church can be held to prove anything in favour of Mr Baylee's argument, it must be such as to confirm the truth of his original proposition, viz.—that the Jews had in their Church a *sufficient* guide, although not an *infallible* one. Now, even granting Mr Baylee to have shown from the passage referred to, that the Jewish Church had *not* been to the man born blind an infallible guide, what then? since, from Mr Baylee's own showing, neither had it been to him a *sufficient* one.—Had Mr Baylee proved from the chapter cited, that although the Jewish Church had *not* been to the man born blind an *infallible* guide, yet it had been to him a *sufficient* one; his argument would have been in harmony with his original proposition, and a confirmation of the same, which he meant it to be. As it is, however, it actually militates against his original assertion, in as far as it goes to establish the fact that, from the moment the guide in question ceased to be *infallible*, it ceased likewise to be *sufficient*; or, in other words, *was not sufficient*, precisely because *it was not infallible*.

Two considerations, moreover, must be carefully kept in view, when question of the Jewish Church as a guide in matters of religious belief, *1stly*, the deposit of the Mosaic revelation, with the promises, prophecies, and types relating to it; and, *2ndly*, the realizing of this law of shadows in the person of the Messiah. The first of these considerations bears upon a period of fifteen hundred years; the second upon the comparatively brief space of time that formed the epoch of transition from the Mosaic to the Christian dispensation. When, therefore, it is question of the Jewish Church, as of a guide to the Jewish people in matters of religious belief, that guidance must evidently be understood to refer to the burden of the Mosaic revelation, of which said

Church was the only lawful interpreter for fifteen consecutive centuries ; and so far, (as I have already established from that argument of common sense, of which Mr Baylee *granted all the premises*, and *did not disprove the inference*,) so far, the guidance of the Jewish Church *must* have been infallible ; or, no Jew, after Moses' day, could ever have been absolutely certain of the ground-work of his faith.

But, in as far as the Mosaic Covenant was necessarily transitory of its nature, and a time was to come, according to its own prophecies, when its Church was so culpably and obstinately *to reject the person* of the Messiah to whom the prophecies were applicable, as to lead thereby to its own rejection, and to the sacrifice of Calvary ; the practical infallibility of the Jewish Church was evidently limited, both as to the extent of its teaching, and as to the time of its existence. Hence, there is no sound logic in appealing exclusively to the period of its prophesied defection, for a proof that the Jewish Church had never been infallible in the testimony which it previously bore to what formed the subject matter of the revelation of Moses ; or, in other words, to attempt to prove, that because the Jewish Church eventually rejected the person of the Messiah *who had come*, therefore its guidance had never been such as to have deserved implicit reliance from those generations of Israel whom it had taught for so many long centuries to believe in the reality *of His coming*. In point of fact, the special mission of the Jewish Church, as an infallible guide to God's chosen people, was less to pronounce on the person of the Messiah, than to guard, unadulterated, the deposit of the Mosaic revelation, as a dispensation prophetic of, and preparatory to His advent. The burden of proving his own identity with the Messiah foretold, lay with CHRIST himself ; holding, as Moses had done before him, an

extraordinary mission, and ready as Moses had been, to prove that mission by the exercise of extraordinary powers. That after the most public and unequivocal manifestation of these extraordinary powers on the part of the Redeemer throughout the miraculous career of his Apostolic life, the Jewish Church and the Jewish people were without excuse in not acknowledging Him as the Messiah promised to, and expected by their fathers, is true, no doubt; but this has nothing whatever to do with the nature and legitimacy of the authority of the Jewish Church, up to that period when *He* came to supersede it, who in this very same chapter of St John declares of Himself: “As long as *I* “am in the world, *I am the light of the world*,” (ver. 5.)

As the guardian, then, and interpreter of the Mosaic revelation, common sense demonstrates that the Jewish church *must* have been infallible up to the coming of the Messiah; *or*, no Jew after the death of Moses, could ever have been absolutely certain of what had been revealed through Moses. On the other hand, the very nature of the revelation to which the Jewish Church bore testimony, as well as the facts connected with the whole history of the Redeemer, prove with equal clearness, that the infallible mission of the Jewish Church must have stopped short of an open recognition of the Messiah; *or* the prophecies would have proved false, and Calvary’s sacrifice never could have been accomplished.

What inference, then, can now be drawn against the necessity of an infallible authority in matters of faith, from the instance of the man born blind, as quoted by Mr Baylee? Because the Jewish Church was not infallible, says Mr Baylee, the Jewish Church misled that man.—Then, if the Jewish Church misled that man, the Jewish Church was clearly not unto that

man a *sufficient* guide. Now, Mr Baylee's primary assertion was, that the Jewish Church *was a sufficient guide*, although not *an infallible one*. Mr Baylee's argument therefore contradicts himself, in the first place.—Secondly, the very instance quoted by Mr Baylee, proves undeniably the truth of what I had previously maintained, that as men never can believe things revealed in the absence of infallible teaching, so Almighty God has never called upon them so to believe, without providing them at the time with the like authority. The man born blind had been cured of his blindness by the Redeemer, and from this miraculous fact, he had inferred that Christ was a prophet sent of God. For having boldly avowed his conviction, the Pharisees put him out of the synagogue ; or, as Mr Baylee expresses it, the Jewish Church excommunicates him. Here, then, we have a Jewish mind suspended, as it were, for the moment between the unsurmountable strength of its own conscientious conviction, and the antagonistic teaching of an expiring authority, presuming to decide *ultra vires* of its own infallibility ; yet so surrounded still with all the outward semblances of a Divinely instituted Church, as to be naturally appealed to in matters of doubt. What is the consequence to the man born blind ? Is he left in a state of perplexity, to decide for himself ? No ; for *He* who was at the time the true light of the world, and its *Infallible Teacher* in reference to his own nature, character, and mission, immediately seeks him out, that he may not be left without *infallible guidance*.

“ Jesus,” says St John, “ heard that they had cast him out ; and *when he had found him*, he said unto him : “ Dost thou believe on the Son of God ? He answered, “ and said : Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on “ him ? and Jesus said unto him : Thou hast both seen

“ him, and it is he that talketh with thee And he said
 “ *Lord, I believe : and he worshipped him.*”

The man born blind, then, had up to the moment of his cure, believed on the *infallible teaching* of the Jewish Church, that a Messiah was to come ; and in this the Jewish Church had not deceived him, for this was the great truth of the revelation to which that Church had been sent to bear unerring testimony. After his miraculous cure by the Redeemer, the man born blind believed that He who had cured him was *Christ* or the *Messiah*, because the Son of God assured him that he was so, having previously given Divine authority to his words, by performing such works as no one could perform, who was not “ sent of God ;” (v. 30, 31, 32, 33 ;) and in this case surely he believed on the teaching of *infallible authority*. In short, the whole tenor of the Gospel narrative, the nature of the Jewish Church, and the dictates of common reason, all unite to show that *without the teaching of some outward, audible, infallible authority*, the man born blind never *had* believed, and never *could have* believed anything partaking the character of a Divine Revelation.

I was next asked to produce any passage from Scripture tending to establish the infallible authority of the Jewish Church. I quoted the beginning of the 23d chapter of St Matthew’s Gospel, to prove the acknowledged existence of that authority ; and, as an instance of its exercise, the consultation which took place on the arrival in Jerusalem of the wise men from the East, and the answer given to the inquiries made as to the birth-place of the Messiah.

Mr Baylee met the first quotation by no other answer than a reference to the excommunication of the man born blind, as an instance in which the authority of the Jewish Church had not proved *infallible*, but

the reverse. I have just shown what this reference was worth ; having anticipated my notice of it, because belonging, properly speaking, to the previous argument. I need not therefore return to it here, beyond remarking, that it was no refutation of our Saviour's words, on which Mr Baylee, thinking, perhaps, and with some reason, that the shorter the comment the better, remained altogether silent. Let them be quoted, then, once more, and they will speak for themselves. "Then spake Jesus
 " to the multitude and to his disciples, saying, the
 " Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All
 " therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that
 " observe and do, but do not ye after their works ; for
 " they say, and do not."

To say that the Scribes and Pharisees *sat in the seat of Moses*, was with the Jews making use of the most striking expression that could convey to their minds the idea that the Scribes and Pharisees *had succeeded to the authority of Moses*. After having borne witness to the fact of their holding that authority, Christ proceeds to define the nature of the obedience due to it ; and he unequivocally declares, that *because* the Scribes and Pharisees hold such authority,—**THEREFORE** are the people, and even his disciples, to yield submission to it, not in small things only, but in great ones ; not in certain circumstances only, but always ; in a word, that they are to yield to said authority that species of obedience, which it never can be made the duty of any rational creature to render, unless to an absolutely unerring, or in other words, *infallible authority*. *All, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do.*"

It is in vain to attempt to explain away the meaning of these words into any other sense than that which they naturally convey, or, there is an end of all meaning in human language ; and that man would be

justified who would broach the paradox, that, whenever a passage of Scripture clearly conveys a specific meaning, it may always be understood as implying the contrary ; or, that the commands of the Decalogue are not binding, because it is impossible for the merest simpleton to mistake the natural meaning of what they command or forbid. Our blessed Saviour, in fact, does not use more emphatic language to point out the nature and extent of the obedience which he exacts from those who shall believe in His own name ; for, when sending His apostles “ *to teach all nations*,” he defines the nature of the disciple’s obedience by that of the teacher’s commission, and he has recourse to the self same expressions as those he applies to the Jewish Church. “ *All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do.*” “ Going therefore, teach “ all nations,.....teaching them to observe *all things* “ *whatsoever* I have commanded you.” Would any man in his senses, presume to gather from the latter words that they authorised any limit in the obedience due from Christians to the teaching of the Apostles ? Then, on what ground can the former words be held to imply a more limited obedience to the teaching of the Jewish Church ?—But, in the latter case, the obedience is such as can only be claimed by an *infallible teacher* ; such, therefore, must it have been in the former. From those words, then, of our blessed Lord, it is clear that HE at least held the authority of the Jewish Church, with regard to the Mosaic revelation, to have been an *infallible authority*.

As an instance of the exercise of that authority, I mentioned the case of the wise men, *infallibly led* by a miraculous star to inquire at Jerusalem for the birth-place of the Messiah ; the answer given them by the organs of the Jewish Church, in the absence of any other infallible guidance at the moment ; and the con-

firmation of that decision by the reappearance of the extraordinary *infallible guide*, the star, "*which went before them, till it came, and stood over where the young child was.*"

To this Mr Baylee replied, that I had misstated the Gospel narrative; *1stly*, because the star had not led the wise men to Jerusalem—they had simply seen a star in the East, from which they had inferred the birth of the King of the Jews; and they had naturally gone to Jerusalem, to inquire after the place of his birth. *2ndly*, because the answer of the authorities of the Jewish Church had been made, not to the wise men, but to king Herod. And, *3rdly*, because the wise men on leaving Jerusalem, had gone, not to Bethlehem, but to Nazareth; thus leaving Herod the opportunity of perpetrating the massacre of the innocents. Besides, there was no need, said Mr Baylee, for the star to lead the wise men to Bethlehem; Bethlehem being a mere village.

According, then, to Mr Baylee, the above Scriptural reference fails in proof of an instance of the infallible teaching of the Jewish Church, because of its inaccuracy; therefore, it fails in proportion to its inaccuracy, and in that proportion only. Let us see, now, how far this inaccuracy goes.

The star, says Mr Baylee, had not led the wise men to Jerusalem.

That the star had led the wise men to Jerusalem, in the same way in which it unquestionably led them out of it, "going before them," the Evangelist, I grant, does not say; but he does not say the reverse. When therefore, Mr Baylee asserts so positively that the star did not thus lead the wise men to Jerusalem, he says so on his own authority, not on that of St

Matthew. The precise manner, however, in which they were influenced or directed by the star, previous to their arrival at Jerusalem, is of little moment to the argument, since certain it is, that the wise men found their way to Jerusalem, or came there, in consequence of having seen that star. No matter, then, in what way they were led to Jerusalem; they came in consequence of having learned from the star that the Messiah was born, and, in as far as it was their teacher in this respect, so far it was their guide, and it was an *infallible one*.

In whatever way the star had guided them previous to their arrival at Jerusalem, it was clearly not visible to them during their sojourn in that city, and it was then they put the question, no matter to whom, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" The answer given them by the authorities of the Jewish Church was, that his birth-place was at Bethlehem; and they rest their answer on the prophecies, to the genuineness of which the priests and scribes bear exclusive testimony, and on the true sense of which they are consulted as their only interpreters. They do not say: You will find Him at Bethlehem; but, keeping strictly within the limits of the authority they had been intrusted with, to-wit, the power to guard and interpret faithfully the Mosaic revelation, they speak unhesitatingly as to the place of the Messiah's birth. By the very fact, then, of their answer:—"In Bethlehem of Juda," they became at the moment the only guides to the wise men, and their guidance did not mislead them. Nay, God worked a miracle, to confirm the truth of their decision, for although the wise men were now directed where to go, the star, nevertheless, re-appeared to them on their leaving Jerusalem, and "went before them, till it came" and stood over where the young child was."

But, insists Mr Baylee, the answer of the Jewish Church was given not to the wise men, but to king Herod.

What matter to whom the answer was in the first place spoken? It was given unquestionably as a solution of the query put by the wise men—"Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" and on hearing that answer of the Jewish Church, "king Herod called the wise men . . . and he sent them to Bethlehem, saying: Go, and search diligently for the young child." The answer, then, was, although spoken directly to king Herod, given in reality to the wise men, since it was intended as a reply to their question; and they were sent to act upon the faith of its truth.

I most readily acquit Mr Baylee of all intention to quibble; but looking to the intrinsic value of this portion of his reasoning, he must forgive me for saying, that I can view it in no other light than as a specimen of wretched chicanery, unworthy of a serious argument; since it is clearly of no importance to whom the priests gave their answer directly, or, in the first instance to the wise men, or to Herod, or to Herod's stable-boy. It was in reality given to them of whose difficulty it was a solution, and to whose knowledge it was ultimately conveyed, that they might act upon it.

Finally, says, Mr Baylee, the above scriptural reference is inaccurate, (and therefore no proof,) because the wise men did not go to *Bethlehem* at all, but to *Nazareth*!

If this idea of Mr Baylee be correct, it certainly affords a most remarkable illustration of the saying of a French poet: "*Le vrai peut quelque fois n'être pas vraisemblable.*" Let us see. The wise men come to Jerusalem, utterly ignorant as to *where* He was that was born King of the Jews. They inquire. Herod

assembles the teaching authorities of the Jewish Church. The priests and scribes answer not *where* He is, but they teach from the prophecies *where* He was to be born ; and they say, "In Bethlehem of Juda." This is the only answer given to the query of the wise men. On hearing it, Herod, says St Matthew, "called the " wise men.....*and he sent them to Bethlehem,*" and " said, Go and search diligently for the young child." THEREFORE, adds Mr Baylee, they went to *Nazareth* !

They went to Nazareth ? Why, then, on quitting Jerusalem, the wise men must have taken leave, not of Herod, but of their senses ; or, they must have been personally inspired, and have known already where the child was. For men who sought to remove their ignorance of a place, by inquiring where it was, to have started in a totally different direction from that indicated unanimously by those from whom they had inquired, would have been giving unmistakeable evidence of aberration of intellect. Now, if this was not the case of the wise men, they must have gone to Nazareth, because they already knew by inspiration that they would find the Child there. But, in that supposition, why pretend ignorance, by asking *where* they are to find him ? They could not, therefore, have been inspired before leaving Jerusalem, or they must have acted as hypocrites.—How, then, is Mr Baylee to get these wise men fairly on their way to Nazareth ? Will he say, that, notwithstanding the distinct indication and injunction they had received from the priests and from Herod, the wise men really departed from Jerusalem to go to no particular place, until the star providentially reappeared to lead them into Galilee, "when they rejoiced," says the Evangelist, "with exceeding great joy ?" — If so, one might add, that their joy was not without exceeding great reason, in as

far as, not knowing whether they were ever to see the star again, their conduct would, to say the least of it, have been stamped throughout with the greatest imprudence.

The truth is, this going to Nazareth is altogether a visionary travel, and Mr Baylee's reasons in its support, are as fanciful as the journey. They went to Nazareth, says he, to leave Herod the opportunity of perpetrating the massacre of the innocents. This would be so far intelligible, had Herod concealed from the wise men the answer of the priests, and sent them into Galilee ; but it is expressly said by the Evangelist, that " Herod sent them to Bethlehem." Besides, Herod did surely not confide to the wise men, that he intended to massacre all the children about Bethlehem under a certain age. How, then, could their going to Bethlehem have raised any suspicion as to Herod's design, especially, as he had added, that he wanted correct information about the abode of the child, that he too might go and "*worship him!*" Was he likely to get that information by sending them to Nazareth, believing, as he did, on the teaching of the Jewish doctors, that the child was to be born "*in Bethlehem of Juda?*" Such a supposition is absurd.

The star again, says Mr Baylee, did not lead the wise men to Bethlehem, because Bethlehem was a *mere village*, and they required no such guidance to find it out! Bethlehem a *mere village!* why, what has that to do with the question? Had Bethlehem been but a single hut, at half-a-mile's distance from Jerusalem, might not the star still have "gone before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was?" If this portion of the Gospel narrative be true at all, the star, here mentioned, could not have been placed in the heavens at the usual altitude of stars, or,

humanly speaking, it never could have been serviceable in pointing out the most distant town. But, if not at the usual height of stars, why, may it not have served as a guide to lead the wise men to the most trifling spot, or one within the shortest distance of their point of departure?—"They required no such guidance to find it out."—Does Mr Baylee intend to imply by this, that extraordinary guidance is never permitted by the Almighty, where, strictly speaking, the means of ordinary guidance are at hand? Then the angel who delivered St Peter from prison, must have acted under a mistake, when having entered Jerusalem, he passed on with him "through one street;" since Peter might evidently have found his own way, from the moment he felt himself free, within the city gate. To reason, as Mr Baylee here attempts to do, is to play with an argument.

Reason however as he will, one difficulty yet awaits Mr Baylee, from which he cannot escape. The wise men either went to Bethlehem, or they went to Nazareth. If they went to Bethlehem, they confessedly went on the teaching of the Jewish Church, (at the moment their only guide,) a guidance afterwards confirmed by the reappearance of the supernatural guide, the star, that "*went before them, until it came and stood over where the young child was.*" And, in that case, they were led to the knowledge of a revealed fact, through the medium of the teaching of a Church, which proved *infallible*.

If they went to Nazareth, they were led thither, according to Mr Baylee's own showing, by the guidance of a miraculous star, and in like manner, came to the knowledge of a revealed fact, through the medium of guidance that was *infallible*. In either case, they came to the discovery of revelation, exclusively through the medium of *infallible teaching*.

To sum up this portion of the argument, Mr Baylee's only ground for objecting to the above Scripture reference, as establishing an instance of infallible teaching on the part of the Jewish Church, or of the exercise of infallible authority in teaching, as possessed by, and acknowledged to reside in that Church, *was* its inaccuracy. Now, I have shown that there is no inaccuracy in the case, except on his, Mr Baylee's part. Therefore, my reasoning remains unanswered by Mr Baylee ; therefore, the words of our blessed Saviour in the 23rd chapter of St Matthew, *are* a proof of the acknowledged existence of *infallibility* in the Jewish Church, and the answer of that Church to the query of the wise men, *is* an instance of its exercise.

If Mr Baylee wishes for a confirmation of the infallible authority of the Jewish Church from the revealed words of the *Old Law*, let him turn to the unbiased consideration of such passages as those which occur in the 17th chapter of Deuteronomy, and to which he himself made allusion.

“ If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, *being matters of controversy within thy gates* ;* then, shalt thou

* In order to understand clearly the strict applicability of this passage of Deuteronomy to the question here under discussion, it must be remembered, that in the Hebrew Commonwealth, of all matters relating directly to religious belief, or to the outward forms of Divine worship, as regulated by the provisions of the ceremonial law, the Jewish priesthood were invariably the natural and only competent judges. Civil matters, again, were of the resort of the lay magistrate, or of the king. But as the Jews were not governed in virtue of laws deriving their sanction from any Magna Charta of their own, but by a legislative code emanating immediately and exclusively from a Divine revelation ; it necessarily followed, that, whenever there arose a difficulty as to questions of right or of fact, which the lay tribunals could not satisfactorily solve ; the civil magistrate, were it the king himself, was held bound, from the very nature of the law which he administered, to refer the case for solution to the high priest of the time. So it was, that matters in themselves apparently

“ arise, and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, and thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire; *and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment: and thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the Lord shall choose, shall show thee; and thou shalt observe to do according TO ALL THAT THEY INFORM THEE: according to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, THOU SHALT DO: thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee, to the right hand nor to the left.* And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest, that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, *even that man shall die; and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel.*”

Is it possible to define the obedience due to unerring, infallible authority, in stronger or more explicit terms? Again, in the 44th chapter of Ezekiel, ver. 24, “ And in controversy, *they*, (the priests) shall stand in judgment; and *they shall judge it according to my judgments,*” &c. or, as the Catholic version gives it: “ They shall stand in *my* judgments, and shall judge.”

Whether we look, then, for a definition of the teaching authority of the Jewish Church to the revealed words of the New or of the Old Testament, we find it so described, that no other term can reasonably be made applicable to it, than that of *infallible*; for, wherever obedience is enjoined without a limit, the authority for

of mere civil import, became not unfrequently among the Jews, real instances of religious controversy, requiring a reference to the priests. The nature of their decision in such cases, is unmistakeably defined in what follows of the above passage.

which such obedience is claimed, must necessarily be without an imperfection.

Mr Baylee again argued *generally* against the necessity of an *infallible witness* to a Divine revelation, from the fact, that baptised infants, who die in infancy, are saved, without the knowledge of the positive doctrines of revealed religion ; to whose case he assimilated that of all men having no means of acquiring any similar knowledge ; and from whence he inferred, as a generally undeniable conclusion, that a positive knowledge of the doctrines of revealed religion is not essential to salvation ; nor, consequently, is the existence essential of any infallible witness, through whose testimony we may learn what these doctrines certainly are.

Before proceeding to lay bare the fallacy of this argument, let me ask, in the first place, how, (apart from the testimony of an infallible witness,) Mr Baylee happens to be so very sure that baptised infants, who die in infancy, are saved in virtue of their baptism ? Does the revelation itself, (always supposing it to have been proved,) teach this so clearly, that no one can doubt it ? No ; says the Baptist Protestant, for the revelation declares, (Mark xvi. 16.) “ He that *believeth* “ and is baptised shall be saved :” but mere infants are incapable of belief ; therefore, they are not susceptible of baptism. By what process of reasoning is this same Baptist Protestant to be silenced by Mr Baylee, starting as he (the Baptist) does from Mr Baylee’s own principle, viz., that the revelation itself is infallible, but that there exists not any infallible expositor of its meaning ? Mr Baylee, therefore, if consistent, is from the outset reduced to admit that he cannot *prove* himself right ; and that, in fact, he may be mistaken—or, he must grant that he owes the certainty of his belief about baptised infants, (as he most unquestionably does,)

to the testimony of an infallible witness of revelation, in other words, to the unerring teaching of the Catholic Church. The first sin, then, of the above argument is, that it presumes to rest on a proposition, the truth of which is discoverable only through the very medium of which it purports to annihilate the existence. But this is not its only sin, for it unscrupulously grasps at a broader conclusion than what its premises warrant.

Had Mr Baylee reasoned thus: A positive knowledge of the doctrines of revealed religion is not in all cases essential to salvation, if any case can be shown wherein salvation can be obtained without it. Now, all baptised infants, who die in their infancy, are undoubtedly saved, although incapable of any positive knowledge of the doctrines of revealed religion. Therefore, a positive knowledge of the doctrines of revealed religion is not in all cases essential to salvation.—The argument, though strangely inconsistent in Mr Baylee's mouth, would, in point of form, at least, have been a sound one. But such is not Mr Baylee's reasoning; it is as follows:

Baptised infants who die in infancy, although incapable of any positive knowledge of the doctrines of revealed religion, are avowedly saved. Now, the case of such men as have had no opportunity of acquiring any similar knowledge, is exactly parallel to that of the the above infants. Therefore, *to all and sundry, whether they have no opportunity* of acquiring positive knowledge of the doctrines of a revealed religion, or, *whether they have*, the testimony of an infallible witness as to the nature of such doctrines, is altogether unnecessary.

Mr Baylee has here taken into his conclusion a class of individuals who were not only *not included* in his premises, but who were virtually *excluded* from them.—Mr Baylee's argument, then, is entirely worthless.

Such, however, is the deplorable result to which Protestantism is invariably driven, from its denying the necessity of *infallible* teaching in matters of faith ; viz., that positiveness of belief is to a Christian of comparative insignificance. In other words, according to Protestantism, although Almighty God saw fit to reveal certain specific truths in reference to man's salvation, which, left to themselves, men never could have discovered ; and although the Almighty deigned to become incarnate, for the purpose of promulgating in person the knowledge of those truths ; yet, He saw no necessity of establishing any means through which said truths could become certainly known to those for whose salvation they had been revealed ; nor is it at the present day of any absolute moment to salvation, whether we come to the knowledge of them or not.—Whoever is prepared to admit this monstrous theory, may yield ready assent to Mr Baylee's argument ; for, however lame its construction, such undeniably is its drift ; and the end to which it naturally leads, is to reduce the fact of divine revelation in general, and of the Christian dispensation in particular, to a solemn mockery. For, if, on the one hand, there be no outward witness in the world through whose teaching, even the most ignorant of Christians can come *infallibly* to the knowledge of such positive doctrines of revelation as the fact, that the Son of God became man for him, and died upon a cross for his redemption ; and if, on the other, the knowledge of such positive doctrines of revelation be not in reality essential to a Christian for his salvation ; then, as I have already had occasion to inquire of the first covenant, I must now ask of the second,—As a manifestation of divine truth, what is practically the value of the Christian revelation ? What more is it than a useless dispensation ?

Mr Baylee finally declared that his only infallible

guide was the written word of God, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit.

I asked him if he considered himself bound by every precept clearly laid down in scripture, and not repealed therein. On his answering in the affirmative, I inquired of him how in that case he scrupled not at eating game, because of the blood that is in it ; since, the precept of abstaining from blood, is unequivocally laid down in scripture, as having been given to Noah, to the Jews under the Mosaic law, and again to all Christians at the apostolic council of Jerusalem, where it is emphatically ranked among “ necessary things.” And I argued, that, ere he could venture to set aside that prohibitory precept, as one no longer binding, he must either contradict the infallibility of Scripture, or acknowledge the authority of the Church, as an infallible witness to the true sense of Scripture ; since it is impossible to allege any rational justification of such a gross departure from the words of Scripture, save the unerring traditionary teaching of the Church.

To this Mr Baylee’s *only* answer was, that the idea of eating blood had never occurred to him when eating game ; that if he had thus ate blood, he had done wrong ; and that he never would do so again. It is almost unnecessary to remark, that this answer is not in harmony with the daily practice of the Anglican Church, of which Mr Baylee is a minister ; there existing among Anglicans, as a body, no scruple whatever on the score of eating blood.

The same difficulty recurs, and with equally crushing logic, in regard to other precepts, as clearly enjoined in the Scripture, and no where therein clearly recalled,—the strictly commanded observance, for instance, of the seventh day of the week, our present Saturday. Where is that command withdrawn in Scripture ? No where. Yet in what Protestant com-

munion is that command obeyed and acted upon, at the present day? Protestants, on the other hand, are everywhere loud in their outcry for even a pharisaical observance of the first day of the week, our Sunday. Where is there in all Scripture a clear command to keep holy that day? No where. The only shape in which Scripture can be quoted in its support, is as a record of the practice of the Apostles. But supposing even such apostolic practice to be unquestionably vouched for in the Scripture of the New Testament, that practice must have existed, and been followed, before it was recorded in the book called the ACTS. The practice, therefore, of the Apostles is in reality, traditionary teaching, not, strictly speaking, scriptural authority.

The practical result of all this inconsistency, on the part of Protestantism, is, that its own children have come at length to point the finger of scorn at what they boldly term its "religious insincerity." As an instance of it, "consider," says a Protestant writer in the present number of the *Edinburgh Review*,*—"consider the weekly recitation of the fourth commandment, and *the response to it*, without one word of comment or qualification on the part of the Church, notwithstanding that nobody believes a *Jewish Sabbath* to be either binding upon Christians, or possible in modern life; and not the strictest puritan of us all, not Scotland herself, ever thinks of observing it as such.† The im-

* *Edinburgh Review*, October 1850, page 350.

† *Minister*. "God spake these words, and said,.....Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath-day. Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do; but the SEVENTH day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt do no manner of work; thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant; thy cattle, and the stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep THIS law."—*The order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, as in the Book of Common Prayer.*

mense variance between the letter of this law, and the most rigid practical interpretation of it, confounds all English ideas of Sabbath breaking and Sabbath keeping; creates unnecessarily an awful *malum prohibitum*; and lays snares in the path of innumerable honest and devout men and women. If the fourth commandment be indeed a law of the Christians, it is too certain that all Christians deliberately break it; but if it be a law of the Jews only, then all the scandal is chargeable upon those who, professing to have divine truth in their keeping, recite this law weekly from the altar, as if it were part of the Sermon upon the mount."

So much for what is deemed mental food, not unsuited to the tastes of the most cultivated intellects of this country. Now, for a still more racy specimen of what is openly set forth by the Weekly Despatch, as nurture "for the million."

"Orthodoxy," says this paper, "is no longer permitted both to have its cake and eat it. Society is too astute to suffer it to refute Popery by an appeal to reason, and then to turn round upon the rationalist, and denounce 'carnal reason,' by appealing to authority. Mankind see that there is no *juste-milieu* in religion, any more than in morals or opinion; that, indeed, the 'middle course' means no more than this, that while fanaticism declares that three and three are one, and common sense asserts they come to six, your *moderado*, condemning extremes, pronounces both to be in the wrong, and suggests, that three and three probably amount to four and a half. The clear-sighted intellectual radicalism of the age insists upon professors of religion being hot or cold, or anything but tepid. Some who have been cradled in the fear of the pride of human reason, at last insist upon compelling their teachers to become true to their principles, and to go back to repose on the bosom of Roman infallibility. Others, who have been nurtured in hatred of Popish assumption, have at length become convinced that no half-faced fellowship can be tolerated in patching up a hollow treaty betwixt the authority of an Anglican Church, or Caledonian Conventicle, and the free and unfettered exercise of the intellect in matters of religion; and therefore they insist, that if reason has liberty to explode the

errors of Popery, it cannot be fettered in passing an independent and supreme judgment upon every dogma of any creed. Whatever may be right, Lutheranism and Calvinism are seen to be clearly in the wrong. If a priest may not 'judge another man's servant,' why may a parson or a presbyter do that which to a monk is forbidden? If there be no Pope, why should there be apostolic succession? If there should be no father confessor, why, in the rubric of Episcopacy, should 'the sick man be here enjoined to confess his sins?' If Peter had not the keys, how should the Confession of Faith assert 'that God hath given to Christian ministers the keys of the kingdom of heaven?' If absolution is a damnable heresy, why should the Anglican parson be permitted, in the words of the Church service, to say, 'By the authority of Jesus Christ committed to me, I hereby absolve thee from all thy sins?' We therefore most cordially rejoice in the increasing accession of adherents to the Pope from the ranks of Episcopacy, Methodism, and Calvinism, as a clear indication of a more hearty honesty of thought in orthodox Protestantism. The political writer is forced into polemics when religious controversy is itself political. The masses of the people look on in amazement and with contempt, upon the antics of their ecclesiastical instructors. They demand of statesmen how they dare to insult the national understanding, by handing over the religious education of a people to a crew of dreaming fanatics, who are daily denouncing each other's heresies, and ending by their own perversion to the embraces of the scarlet lady. They demand, if Exeter is wrong, why is he paid for teaching error? if he is right, why is the see of Canterbury not vacated by a pontiff whom Exeter proclaims to be a heretic? and why does Gorham teach, if his spiritual superior pronounces his teaching to be damnable? If an answer be not given to these interrogatories, it will at last be extorted, and a nation will cease to pay for what its professors have ceased to believe."*

As to the qualification Mr Baylee has appended to Scripture as his infallible guide,—the assistance, to-wit, of the Holy Spirit, this is going back to where Barclay placed the question a hundred years ago; when, speaking of the only unerring way of coming to the knowledge of what is Scripture, and what is not,

* Weekly Despatch, Sep. 22, 1850.—The circulation of the Weekly Despatch is stated to be 68,000.

he says, "There is then this unavoidable necessity to say, we know it by the same Spirit from which it was written; or, otherwise to step back to *Rome*, and say, we know by tradition, that the Church hath declared it to be canonical; and the Church is infallible. Let them find a mean, if they can."* Is Mr Baylee ready to say that when Luther and Calvin, each claiming the assistance of the same Holy Spirit, could not agree between themselves as to what was Scripture and what was not, but openly and loudly, contradicted one another; they both believed, spoke, and wrote under infallible guidance? Or, is Mr Baylee prepared to show "the mean," asked for by Barclay, between the guidance of the Spirit, and the infallibility of the Church? Barclay claimed the Scripture, with the assistance of the Spirit, for his only infallible guide; and it taught him, that "baptism was a pure and spiritual thing, to-wit, the baptism of the *Spirit* and *fire*; and that as to the baptism of infants, it is a mere human tradition, for which neither precept nor practice is to be found in all the Scripture." Is this what the infallible Scripture, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, teaches Mr Baylee to be the revealed truth? To broach the above principle is, in fact, practically to transfer to each individual the privilege of being himself the infallible witness to revelation. The only difficulty in the working of the principle is, that the witnesses don't agree.

Once more, then, besides the written revelation, there is somewhere an *infallible* witness to its genuineness, as well as an equally *infallible expositor* of its true sense; or there are no certain means at the present day of knowing what truth there really is in the facts and doctrines that form the groundwork and the burden of a Christian's belief. Short

* Barclay's Apology, Prop. III.

of this, every man must be his own church ; and a teaching church of any kind, becomes a glaring inconsistency ; a thing that may so far be bolstered up as to outward appearances, by human law, because its creature ; or submitted to, from habit, by such as have never really investigated its claims to their obedience ; but in the long run, a thing to be spoken of only “ with a sigh or a smile ;” a thing used up, and to be thrown aside as an antiquated piece of lumber in the intellectual world ; a very Babel of confusion, such as the Anglican Church is at the present day, whose supreme earthly spiritual Head, (I speak it without disrespect to the person of a Sovereign, whom none more deeply love and reverence than her Catholic subjects,) whose supreme earthly spiritual Head is seen seated on the disciples’ bench in the synagogue of those whose doctrines and teachers that Church condemns ; whose bishops either *dare not*, or *cannot*, define what it is essential to believe of the nature of that heavenly ordained ordinance, without which no man can be a Christian ; where, in short, the confusion of tongues is so great, and the contradiction of minds is so general, that the wisest of her children are every day seen girding themselves to depart ; more fortunate than they of the scriptural Babel, in as far as a pathway lies open before them, by which they may return to where “ the whole earth is still of *one* language and of *one* speech.”

I have now exhausted the question of the necessity of an INFALLIBLE WITNESS to divine revelation, in as far as that question may be said to have been argued in the course of the interview, to which these pages have reference ; and I shall next pass on to notice the other few topics touched upon by Mr Baylee, during the same conversation.

One of these respected the amount of Christian teaching to be found in the books of the Old Testament, and the possibility of converting a Jew to Christianity on purely Protestant grounds.

I was asked by Mr Baylee to mention any one article of Christian doctrine not clearly taught in the Old Testament ; I instanced that of the Trinity, observing, that I did not deny that the Trinity was so far indicated in the Old Testament, but that it was not there so clearly taught, as to have in consequence become a point of general belief among the Jews, the great bulk of whom had no distinct idea of it.

Mr Baylee immediately read as follows, from the 48th chapter of Isaiah. "Come ye near unto me, hear ye this: I have not spoken in secret from the beginning, from the time that it was, there am I ; and now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me."

I observed that this passage did not seem to me to be so very clear, as that it should have conveyed to the Jews a distinct idea of the Christian Trinity ; and that, placing myself in the circumstances of a Jew previous to the Christian revelation, it would not bring conviction to my mind ; on which Mr Baylee somewhat triumphantly replied, that "it did so to the mind of St Athanasius ; and then asked me, which of us was now the true Catholic ?"

In answer to this, I need here, in the first place, simply remark, that a correct conception of the Christian Trinity implies more than the mere idea of *plurality* in the Godhead. It embraces, moreover, the distinction of persons, and their relative mode of being, and of position towards each other, as taught by the formula of belief in Mr Baylee's own Book of Common Prayer, viz., the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Father, made of none, neither created, nor begotten. The Son, *of the Father alone*, not

created, but *begotten*. The Holy Ghost, *of the Father and of the Son*, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but *proceeding*.* Such is the Christian Trinity, and any idea of *plurality* in the Godhead, short of this, is not the Christian Trinity. Now, let me ask Mr Baylee, for whose abilities and acquirements I have the highest respect; able and learned as he may be, could he have ever come to the knowledge of the Christian Trinity, as here defined in the Prayer Book of his own Church, if he had never heard aught of the same, but what he could gather from the above quoted words of Isaiah? There is to this but one possible answer. Mr Baylee could not. Therefore the above text does not clearly teach the Christian Trinity. And if Mr Baylee could not have come to the discovery, how could either the most illiterate, or the most learned Jew?

Mr Baylee might have made more of his quotations than he did. He might have referred me to the triple form of blessing, by the High Priest, as prescribed in ch. vi. of Numbers. "The LORD bless thee, and keep thee. The LORD make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The LORD lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." And he might have commented them thus.—The *Father* is the One from whom is every good and perfect gift. Through the *Son*, we receive *the manifestation of truth*, and through his atonement *grace*. From the *Paraclete* or *Comforter* comes *peace*.—A very fair comment for any Christian to make, who has read the gospels and the epistles of St Paul. Or Mr Baylee might have insisted on the truly remarkable use of the plural number throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, in the names given to God, and placed indifferently in conjunction with plural, or with singular verbs and adjectives. Yet, all this would never convey to us a

* The Athanasian Creed.

correct conception of the Christian Trinity. The most it can give birth to is, the idea that in the Godhead there is unity and plurality.

As to the above words of Isaiah having ever conveyed to the mind of St Athanasius that primary conviction which originally led him to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, as we believe it now ; (and it is of such doctrine, and of such primary conviction that it is here exclusively question,) the assertion is altogether gratuitous. They could not do so, for the reasons just stated. The truth is, the words of Isaiah alluded to, occur only twice in what are called the works of St Athanasius,—once, in an avowedly spurious work, (see page 613 of tome ii. of the Benedictine edition, “*Liber tertius de Trinitate,—contra Marcellinum hereticum,*”) and again, in a genuine work of the same Doctor, his “*First Letter to Serapion.*” In the first work named, the writer confutes the heretic Marcellinus, who, reasoning from the words of Scripture, concluded against the equality of those Persons in the Trinity, with the Father, who had either been *sent* by Him, as the Son ; or one of whom had been *sent* by the other, as the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, *sent* by the Son. Speaking of the asserted inequality of the Holy Spirit with the Son, the writer argues thus : “Your deduction from the words of Scripture is unsound, if it can be shown from Scripture, that, notwithstanding the fact of the Paraclete being *sent* by the Son, the Son himself had previously been sent by the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete. Now, this is evident from the words of Isaiah : “Come ye near unto me, hear ye this : I have not spoken in secret from the beginning ; from the time that it was, there am I ; and now the Lord God and His *Spirit* hath *sent me.*”—From one individual reasoning from Scripture, to another individual also reasoning from Scripture, the argument is a good

one ; in as far as it proves that no inequality can be established against the Holy Spirit, from the mere circumstance of his having been *sent* by the Son. But the argument here is logical, only in the supposition that both parties admitted the above words of Isaiah to refer to the doctrine of the Christian Trinity. Had Marcellinus been a Jew, to whom, for the reasons already given, such reference could not be clear, instead of a heretic to whom it was, the argument would have been as empty of all logic as the wind. Now, it was of a *Jew* that it was exclusively question between Mr Baylee and me, when I denied that the words of Isaiah were so explicit as to convey to the mind a distinct idea of the doctrine of the Trinity we believe in at the present day.

In the letter to Serapion, St Athanasius argues in the very same way, opposing to those who quoted from Amos (iv. 13.) “For lo, he that formeth the mountains, and createth the *wind*,” (*πνευμα*, wind or spirit,) to prove that the Holy Spirit was a created being ; opposing, among other Scriptural passages, the words of Isaiah, “*His Spirit* hath sent me,” to show that in Scripture, the person of the Holy Ghost is never expressed by the word “Spirit” alone ; but that when expressive of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, that word is always qualified by the additions of “God,” or “of the Father,” or “my,” &c. as in Isaiah, “*His Spirit* hath sent me.” Here, again, the mode of argument is legitimate, because addressed to men, who having already the idea of the Christian Trinity, (and arguing from Scripture), could not consistently refuse to admit with Athanasius, that, in the words of Isaiah, the term “Spirit” was undeniably qualified by the possessive pronoun “His,” as the Spirit of God. But does this prove that the words in question had originally conveyed to the mind of St Athanasius its

primary conviction of the doctrine of the Trinity, as we believe it ; or that they must have done so clearly, had St Athanasius been a Jew, instead of a Catholic archbishop ?—Whatever, then, the convictions of St Athanasius arising out of this text, they go for nothing in the present case ; for St Athanasius was a Christian who had already been taught from other sources, *how* he was to believe in the mystery of the Trinity,—whereas Mr Baylee’s proposition was, that the Old Testament taught it clearly to a *Jew*. As well might Mr Baylee maintain, that because the prophecies are clear to us, who live after their fulfilment, they were of equal clearness to those whose existence preceded their accomplishment ; as to infer, that because a Christian, by the light of a second revelation, may see clearly how the truths which he believes were foreshadowed, or imperfectly made known, in a previous law ; therefore, he would have understood the meaning of those shadows, or supplied the imperfection of such teaching, with equal clearness, without the light by which he now views them. What, after all, then, is there in the convictions of St Athanasius, to make a “true Catholic” of Mr Baylee, or to uncatholicize his opponent ?

I next questioned the possibility of any Jew, who is a consistent believer in the Mosaic revelation, being made an honest convert to Protestant Christianity.

Mr Baylee replied, that the best refutation he could give to this proposition, was to mention the fact, that he himself had converted a Jew, who was now a Protestant chaplain at L——.

Now, this fact does not overthrow the correctness of my assertion, since, although the converted Jew alluded to, may have been perfectly sincere, it does not prove him to have been consistent.

Mr Baylee then proceeded to show how he could convey Christian conviction to a Jewish mind ; quoting various texts of the Old Testament, illustrative of a suffering Messiah, who was to atone for sin, and who, according to the prophet Daniel, was to be cut off, before Jerusalem was destroyed. Hence, Messiah must have already come, and have been cut off.*

This is all very well, in as far as it goes, to prove, to-wit, that the advent of the Messiah, and his atonement, are events which have already occurred. But here it is that the difficulty *begins* with a Protestant. The Messiah predicated by the Protestant Christian, is not the Messiah taught by the Catholic Christian ; in as far as some of the most important acts and doctrines of these respective Messiahs are diametrically opposed. Here, then, the Jew who has been brought to stand on the threshold of Christianity, has to choose between *two* Messiahs ; and it is at this point that, if he be consistent, he must necessarily reject the one predicated by all Protestant Christians ; and for this very sufficient reason.

To the well-instructed Jew, the revelation of Moses is, of its nature, a transitory dispensation ; a law of promises, of prophecies, and of types, of which Messiah

* Let it here be remembered, that at an earlier stage of the conversation, Mr Baylee had, while arguing against the infallible teaching of the Jewish Church, represented that Church to have been so far removed from infallibility, as a preparatory teacher ; that not one single Jew had ever learned from it the fact that the Messiah was to suffer, or to be cut off at all. Now, admitting this to have been the case, one cannot but infer, that it is inexplicably strange how the revelation of Moses should have remained comparable to nothing but Egyptian darkness, when expounded only by the prophets and by the whole line of the Jewish priesthood ; while it suddenly bursts forth into all the brightness of the pillar of fire, when expounded by Mr Baylee. Or, supposing the asserted ignorance of the Jews to have sprung from the hopelessly mechanical nature of the prophets, or the defection of their priests as corrupt expounders of the law ; then, it unquestionably affords very strong and solid ground, on which to rest the paramount importance there is, for a competent expositor of the written revelation.

is the centre. In other words, HE is the Saviour promised, the Redeemer foretold, the Victim pre-figured. The Jew, then, naturally assents in reference to the Messiah, to the words spoken of Himself by our blessed Lord, (Luke xxiv. 44.) "All things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning *me*."—Now, among the sacrificial figures written of in the law of Moses, concerning the Messiah, was that of the paschal lamb; and it was written of, as follows:—

"And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months: it shall be the first of the year to you. Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house. And if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbour next unto his house take it, according to the number of the souls: every man, according to his eating, shall make your count for the lamb. Your lamb shall be without blemish; a male of the first year: ye shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats. And ye shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month: and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening.

"And they shall take of the blood, and shall strike it on the two side-posts, and on the upper door-post of the houses wherein they shall eat it. And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it. Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire; his head with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof. And ye shall let

“ nothing of it remain until the morning ; and that
 “ which remaineth of it until the morning, ye shall
 “ burn with fire. And thus shall ye eat it ; with your
 “ loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff
 “ in your hand : and ye shall eat it in haste ; it is the
 “ Lord’s passover.”

We are presented here with a sacrificial figure, having reference to the Messiah, (avowedly the most important one of the whole Mosaic law,) embodying essentially two distinct acts—the destruction of the victim, “ and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel “ *shall kill it,*” and the eating of the victim destroyed, “ *and ye shall eat it.*” Nor can it be pretended that the latter act is of less importance than the former, to the entirety of the type ; for whereas the *killing* of the Lamb is only *once* spoken of ; the *eating* of it is mentioned *six* different times ; every minute direction being given as to how it is to be eaten, and how it is not to be eaten. That the Jews have always understood both acts to belong to the essence of the type, is evident from the fact, that even at the present day, in their ineffectual attempt to comply with the injunctions of the book of Exodus—they consider themselves bound, while eating the paschal lamb, to go in spirit to the temple of Jerusalem, and to unite there, the act of eating the victim, with that of its destruction.

Now, *this* is the point at which every consistent Jew, (even supposing him to have been so far convinced by Mr Baylee,) is forced to part company with Protestant Christianity ; because, the Messiah of the Protestant never can be shown to have realized this type, and, therefore, cannot say of himself, *all things* have been fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses concerning *me*.

When I put this difficulty to Mr Baylee, he answered

that the type of the sacrifice of the paschal lamb had been realized upon the cross. My reply was, yes, as to the destruction of the victim; but who *ate* of that *same victim* after it had been nailed to the cross? I feel happy in here being able to do justice to the candour of Mr Baylee. He at once acknowledged that this kind of eating could no where be found realized but in admitting the doctrine of "TRANSUBSTANTIATION."

This is true. The *whole* type of the paschal lamb is strictly realized by the Catholic Messiah. The *kill-
ing* of the victim was accomplished on Calvary; the *eating* of the victim took place at the Last Supper, and is perpetuated unto the end of time in that Eucharistic sacrifice, wherein the same Body is offered up and partaken of, that was destroyed upon the cross, though, now, in a state of spiritualized existence. And it is remarkable that the realizing of the figure followed immediately the last legitimate commemoration of the type, and that, while the TRUE Priest of the order of Melchisedec thus gave His Body to *be eaten* on the eve of his death, he emphatically identified the Body to be eaten with the Body to be sacrificed. "This is my "Body which *is given for you*," (Luke xxii. 19.) "This is my Body which *is broken for you*," (1 Cor. xi. 24.) But, if it be true, as even Mr Baylee admits, that the Messiah of the Catholic is the only one who can be proved to have realized the most important sacrificial type of the Mosaic revelation; then clearly is *He* the only Messiah of whom a *consistent* Jew can acknowledge the advent. In other words, a well instructed Jew never can, with consistency, become a Protestant Christian. He must remain a Jew, or yield up his obedience to the infallible teaching of the Catholic Church.

Without even an attempt at any direct refutation of what had been said, Mr Baylee instantly diverted attention from the argument, by taking exception to the expression "*real presence*," which I had naturally used in speaking of the presence of Christ in the Catholic Eucharist. He represented it as an expression insidiously resorted to by Roman Catholics, to confuse the whole question. I denied the justice of such an imputation, and explained that the words, Real Presence, were made use of by Catholics, simply because they conveyed an obvious and unmistakeable exposition of their belief, which implies *reality* of presence, in contradistinction to that Protestant teaching on the *nature* of the Eucharistic presence, which defines it ambiguously, a sacramental presence ; or a true presence realized through faith only ; or a mere figurative presence ; in the same way as when question of the *manner* of the reality, Catholics use the word *Transubstantiation*, to express distinctly the difference that exists between Catholic belief on this score, and that of the Lutherans. As it was question, then, in the above argument with the Jew, of keeping in view the fact that, in Catholic teaching, the Messiah of the Eucharist was truly and in reality the Messiah of the cross ; the expression *real presence*, as I had used it, far from being open to any reasonable objection, was the most logically correct expression that possibly could have been used, since it predicated that as in the victim that was *destroyed* on Calvary, there were present the Divinity, the Soul, the Flesh, and the Blood of Messiah ; so, in the victim that is *eaten* in the Catholic Eucharist, there are present, the Divinity, the Soul, the Flesh, and the Blood of the same Messiah.

Mr Baylee now followed up the imputation he had cast upon "*Roman Catholics*," of designedly confusing this question, by alleging the reason for such a design :

viz. that *their* doctrine on the Eucharist could not stand the test of antiquity, for that the early Christian Church had never believed as they do. The only proof adduced by Mr Baylee in support of this last charge, was, that in none of the liturgies of the fifth century, could any trace be shown of the custom of elevating the Host after consecration ; and, with somewhat of meek defiance in his way of putting the request, he once and again asked me if I were prepared to show evidence of the contrary. Not having at hand at the moment the only means of demonstration that could have effectually silenced Mr Baylee, a copy of the liturgies appealed to ; and unwilling to trust my memory on a subject to which he seemed to attach so much consequence ; although strongly impressed that Mr Baylee had committed himself to an assertion he could not make good, I restricted myself to the remark, that I had not the liturgies by me to refer to at the instant, but that before evening they should be in the hands of Lord Feilding, when they would speak for themselves. Meanwhile, all that it was necessary for me to observe in reference to Mr Baylee's confident assertion, was, that whether the liturgies in question afforded evidence of the elevation of the Host after consecration or not, the circumstance was of no absolute moment to the argument ; in as far as all that could be gathered from the fact of that ceremonial in connexion with the correlative act of adoration on the part of the worshippers, would be, that something had been previously done, through which what before had simply been bread and wine, was now become such, as to warrant on the part of all present, the performance of the highest act of homage it is possible for man to pay to his Maker, I mean, adoration. That, in truth, the direct proof which these liturgies afforded of the faith of those who used them, was in

the witness they bore to what was believed to be effected upon the sacramental elements at the moment of consecration. Mr Baylee impressively stated that he held the fact of the elevation as previously alluded to, to be of paramount importance in the settling of the question. Not having the necessary documents within reach, the discussion was necessarily allowed to drop. In the evening, however, of the same day, I made good my promise of the morning, and having understood Mr Baylee to have pointed principally to the liturgies of the Eastern Churches, laid before Lord Feilding, one of the highest authorities known on the subject, Renaudot's "*Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*," from which I now proceed to quote as follows.

"In the Greek liturgies," says Renaudot, (page lxii. of his preliminary Dissertation,) "that have annexed to them the rules to be followed in the performance of the sacramental rite, and commonly called rubrics, (which almost all have that have appeared within the last eight hundred years or more) shortly before the communion, while the solemn words are given utterance to: "Holy things for holy persons," the Eucharist is held up, (*elevatur Eucharistia*); and this observance is called ἁγία ὑψωσις, the holy elevation." Again, (page lxxv. of same Dissertation,) when speaking of the differences which existed between the Greeks and others as to the ceremonial of the Eucharistic oblation, ("ritus mere ceremoniales,") he says, "But the rigidly scrupulous repetition of the words of Christ, the loud response of the "Amen," to those same words; the invocation of the Holy Spirit; the breaking of the oblation; the mixing together of both kinds; *the elevation of the host*, when those words are proclaimed, HOLY THINGS FOR HOLY PERSONS; the order of administering the communion, are found

in all churches the same, with no exception that signifies.”*

In the same first volume of his work, where he gives the liturgies themselves, the following extracts may be found as indicated.

From the Coptic Liturgy used by the Jacobites (or Eutychians,) called the Liturgy of St Basil. Renaudot, tom. i.

Prayer after the Altar is prepared.

Priest. “Do thou, O Lord, make us worthy, by the power of thy Holy Spirit, to perform this ministry...and offer to thee this sacrifice of blessing...grant that our sacrifice may be accepted before thee, for my sins, and for the follies of thy people,” &c. Page 2.

Prayer of the offering of the Bread and Chalice.

“O Lord Jesus Christ, only-begotten Son, Word of God the Father, consubstantial and co-eternal with him and the Holy Ghost...we beg and entreat thy goodness, O Lover of Mankind, look down on this bread and on this chalice, which we have placed on this thy sacerdotal table; bless them+, sanctify them+, and consecrate them+; change them, so that indeed this bread may become thy holy body; and that, which is mixed in this chalice, thy precious blood; that they may be to us a safeguard,” &c. P. 3.

Prayer of the Kiss of Peace.

Priest. “The riches of thy blessings, O Lord, surpass all power of speech, and all conception of the mind. Thou hast hidden from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed to us little ones those things which prophets and kings coveted to see, and did not see. Thou hast graciously committed these mysteries to us sinners, that we should administer them, and be sanctified by them. Thou hast manifested to us the dispensation of thy Son, and the sacred rite of this *unbloody sacrifice*; for this is not a sacrifice of blood, according to the ancient law; or of justification, according to the flesh; but the Lamb is the spiritual victim, slain by a spiritual and incorporeal sword, *in this sacrifice, which we offer to thee.*” Page 12.

Priest. “Jesus Christ instituted this great mystery of piety and religion for us, when he resolved to deliver himself to death for the life of the world.”

* Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio.—Parisiis, 1716.

People. "We believe that it is so, in reality and truth."

Priest. "He took bread into his holy, pure, and immaculate, his blessed and life-giving hands, and he looked up to heaven, to thee, O God, his Father, and the Lord of all."—*People*, "Amen."

The priest shall lift up his eyes saying, "And he gave thanks+."—*People*, "Amen."

Priest, "And he blessed it+,"—*People*, "Amen." Page 14.

(The priest shall thrice sign the oblation with his finger, in the form of a cross.) "And sanctified it+."—*People*, "Amen."

"And broke it, and gave it to his holy disciples and his Apostles, saying: 'Take and eat ye all of this. For this is my body, which is broken for you, and is given for many to the remission of sins: do this in remembrance of me.'"—*People*, "Amen."

The priest holding the chalice in his hand, shall say, "In like manner also the chalice after supper, with water and wine mixed."

The priest shall sign the chalice with a cross thrice, and shall say, "He gave thanks+."—*People*, "Amen."

Priest, "Blessed it+."—*People*, "Amen."

Priest. "Sanctified it+."—*People*, "Amen."

Priest. "He tasted, and gave it to his disciples and holy Apostles, saying, 'Take, drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is poured forth for you, and for many, to the remission of sins: do this in remembrance of me.'"

The priest shall move the chalice in the form of a cross, so as not to shake it. The people shall say, "Amen, this is so,"

Priest. "As often as you shall eat of this bread, and drink of this chalice, you shall announce my death, and confess my resurrection, and be mindful of me, until I come."

People. "We announce thy death, O Lord, and we confess thy resurrection." Page 15.

(The priest shall say the Invocation.)

"We beseech thee, O Christ our God,...that thy Holy Spirit may come down upon us, and upon these gifts and offerings, and may sanctify them, and may make them thy holy of holies."—*People*, "Amen."

The priest raising his voice, "And may he make indeed this bread," *(he shall make the sign of the cross thrice over the bread)* "the holy body of the same Lord our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, which is given for the remission of sins, and eternal life to him who shall partake of it."—*People*, "Amen."

The priest shall make the sign of the cross thrice over the chalice, and shall say, "And this chalice, the precious blood of thy New Testament, of the same Lord our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, which is given for the remission of sins, and life everlasting, to those who shall partake of it."—People, "Amen." Page 16.

Priest, "We pray (God the Father) to make us worthy of the communion and participation of his divine and immortal mysteries, the holy body and precious blood of his Christ."—People, "Amen." Page 19.

The priest elevates the Despoticon (or larger part of the consecrated host), bows down, and says, with a loud voice, "Holy things for holy persons." All the people prostrate themselves, with their faces to the ground. The priest holding his right hand elevated with three parts of the consecrated host in it, says:

"The holy body, and precious, pure, true blood of Jesus Christ the Son, our God, Amen. The body and blood of Emmanuel, our God, this is in real truth, Amen. I believe, I believe, I believe, and confess, to the last breath of my life, that this is the life-giving body of thine only-begotten Son, our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ. He received it from the Lady of us all, the Mother of God, the Sacred and Holy Mary." Page 23.

The priest shall say, "Make us all worthy, O Lord, to receive thy holy body, and thy precious blood, for the cleansing of our bodies, souls, and spirits, and the remission of our sins."

The priest shall communicate, and distribute the body and precious blood to his assistant priest, then to the ministers and people, &c. Page 24.

From the Alexandrian Liturgy of St Basil, taken from the Græco-Arabic. Ibid.

Priest. "Do not reject us sinners, who are offering to Thee this tremendous and 'unbloody sacrifice.'" p. 57. "Grant that with all fear, and a pure conscience, we may offer to thee this spiritual and unbloody sacrifice on this holy altar," &c. Page 61.

The consecration and invocation as above.

After elevating the larger part of the consecrated host, and saying, "Τὰ ἁγία τοῖς ἁγίοις, the priest says the confession of faith, 'The holy body and precious blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God. Amen.'—People, "Amen."

"The holy, precious body, and true blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Amen."—People, "Amen."

"The body and blood of Emmanuel our God, this is truly, Amen."—*People*, "Amen."

"I believe, I believe, I believe, and confess till my last breath, that it is the very life-giving flesh of thy only-begotten Son, our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ. He took it of our Holy Lady, Mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary,* and made it one with His divinity,...and of his own accord delivered for us all this same flesh upon the wood of the holy cross. I truly believe that his divinity never was in any way separated from his humanity, not for a single moment, nor the twinkling of an eye. He delivered this flesh for redemption sake, and for the forgiveness of sins, and life everlasting, to those who partake of it. I believe that such truly is this flesh. Amen."—*The People*—"Amen!" (Page 83.)

Having given the above quotations, and the means of testing their correctness, I have only further to remark, that unless Mr Baylee be prepared to annihilate Renaudot, as competent authority in reference to the Oriental Liturgies—a task he will not easily effect to the satisfaction of those who know any thing of the subject; he must admit that I have produced respectable evidence as to the existence of the custom of elevating the host after consecration, in the Liturgies of the fifth century. Other authorities might of course be added to the testimony of Renaudot; but since his is unquestionably as decisive upon the subject as that of Mr Baylee, it is needless to swell unnecessarily this already too lengthened refutation of his statement.

At this period of our conversation, I was accidentally led to observe, that the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England was, in reality, but a corruption of the Roman Missal, from whence its earliest form was originally derived. This Mr Baylee most unequivocally and peremptorily, not to say indignantly, denied. I must confess, that such a denial,

* So far, I have adopted Bishop Poynter's Translation, which terminates here. (See his work, "Christianity.")

coming from a man of Mr Baylee's apparently wide research in matters historical, astounded me more perhaps than anything I had heard him yet propound. Possibly, my wonder might have still increased, had Mr Baylee thought fit to show from whence the book in question really did come. As this, however, was not attempted, I cannot help thinking that the following will be found, after all, to be the truest story of its origin. To be as brief as possible: for nearly five whole centuries previous to the time of Edward VI., the Eucharistic forms exclusively followed throughout England, were those known under the names of the *USE OF SARUM*, or the *USES of York, Bangor, Hereford, and Lincoln*, one and all, good, orthodox, Latin Roman missals, differing in nothing essential from each other. The Pope's supremacy was abolished in England by act of Parliament, in favour of Henry VIII. A.D. 1534. So little, however, had Latin missals, &c. been meddled with during Henry's day, that ten years after the above act had been passed, we find a privilege and licence granted under the great seal of this same king, to two printers of the name of Grafton and Whitechurch, authorising them, to the exclusion of all others, to print certain "bookes of devine serveyce, and praier bookes, that is to saie, the MASSE BOOKE, ye Graile, the Hympnal, the Antiphonal," &c.

True it is, that two years previous to this, in 1542, a notification had issued from Archbishop Cranmer to the Convocation, "that he had it in command from the king, to acquaint them that all mass-books, &c. should be newly examined, reformed, and castigated, from all manner of mention of the bishop of Rome's name, &c. &c."* Up to this, notwithstanding, the instruments of castigation seem to have been principally confined

* Wilkins' Concilia, as quoted by Maskell, in his "Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, 1844."

to the pen, and to what has since been called "inquisition ink." I remember seeing a specimen of one of these so castigated missals some years ago in the College Library at Manchester. In March 1548, a form was drawn up to be everywhere followed, in *distributing* the communion, of which the first rubric ran thus :—"The time of the communion shall be immediately after that the priest himself hath received the sacrament, *without the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the MASS*, (until other order shall be provided,") &c. Other order *was* provided in January of the ensuing year, and then came forth the Act of Uniformity, establishing the first regular form of Liturgy in *English*, viz., the first Common Prayer Book of Edward VI., with the title : "The Book of the Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, after the use of the Church of England." In this book, the communion service was headed, "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called, *THE MASS*." This first English form of service was inaugurated in St Paul's, on the Day of Pentecost, 1549. A very Indian muck was now run at all Latin "missals, grayles, processionalles, manualles, legendes, pies, portasies, jornalles, and ordinalles, and all other books of service." They went down to the sea in ships, and were transported ; and those left behind were used, says an eye-witness, "by some to scour their candlesticks, by some to rub their boots ; some were sold to grocers and soap-boilers ; a single merchant purchasing at forty shillings a piece, two noble libraries for grey paper."* The clergy of St Paul's were not, however, over favourable to the provisions of the Act, and continued to celebrate the old *masse* privately in the different chapels of the cathedral. Then came a letter from

* Blunt, History of the Reformation, p. 156.

the council to Bishop Bonner, prohibiting all such practises, and beginning thus: "After hearty commendations, having very credible notice that within your cathedral church, there be as yet the Apostle's *mass*, and our Lady's *mass*, and other *masses* of such peculiar names, *under the defence and nomination* of 'our Lady's communion,' and 'the Apostle's communion,' used in private chapels, and other remote places of the same," &c. ;* the date of this letter being June 24, 1549, six whole months after the passing of the Uniformity Act ;—so undutifully did the reformed Church of England, though now in her teens, still cling to the old MASSE book.

That Edward's first Book of Common Prayer bore strongly the impress of the Roman missal, Cardwell, in his preface to "The Two Books of Common Prayer compared," acknowledges as follows :—" *In the great body of their work indeed, they* (its compilers) *derived their materials from the earlier services of their own Church ;* but in the occasional offices, it is clear on examination, that they were indebted to the labours of Melancthon and Bucer ; and through them to the older Liturgy of Nurenberg, which those reformers were instructed to follow. It is a strong evidence of the *prudence and discernment* of the English divines, and especially of the primate who presided over them, that they drew up so *temperate a form of public worship, when the great body of the people, for whom it was designed, were totally unfitted for any further alterations.*" Came next a fierce contest about copes and surplices, and a vast deal of correspondence with Germany and Geneva ; and in the course of rather better than two additional years, the people being held less "unfitted," and "the views of the reformers having expanded," †

* Wilkins, iv. 34.

† Introduction to the present Book of Common Prayer.

an improved form of Edward's first Prayer Book emerged from Parliament, in which its previous strong resemblance to the present MASS book, was not a little impaired. Such was the revised edition of 1552, destined to find its resting-place no longer upon an *altar*, but upon a *table*. This second Book of Common Prayer died with Edward the following year; and on the 5th of October of that year, Parliament was opened under Mary, with a High MASS in LATIN; the *tables* were removed; the *altars* restored; and the only public form of Liturgy in England, became once more the Roman MISSAL. Mary died in 1588. Elizabeth succeeded, and with her returned the Reformation. In 1559, a Parliamentary majority of *three*, again pronounced the doom of the MASS book, and a *third revisal* of the Book of Common Prayer was vouchsafed to the Church. Although it had already been twice pronounced to be the work of the Holy Ghost, there was still found cause for alteration; but this time, it progressed backwards, and was made a little less unlike the parent *mass* book. The Catholics were not to be too imprudently dealt with, and hence "the expression in the Liturgy, which spoke of deliverance 'from the bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities,' was omitted, and the service was permitted to be performed, as in Catholic times, in any part of the church, instead of confining the minister, as heretofore, to the chancel."* Of this revisal, Echard says, "The most considerable alteration was, that the express declaration, *made against the corporal presence*, in the second book set out by King Edward, was now left out; that none might be driven out of the communion of the Church upon that account; therefore the matter was left undetermined, *as a speculative*

* Ibid.

point (!) in which the people were at their liberty.”*
 “The book, as thus set forth, (continues the Introduction already quoted) gave satisfaction to all parties, and the *Roman Catholics* (!) who might have had even the pope’s permission to join in its use, would the Queen have acknowledged his supremacy.” Then, from the very Prayer Book’s account of its own genealogy, it must, in Elizabeth’s day, have thought itself at least, not so very far removed from the orthodox type of the Roman missal. With this *third* and *honest* (?) revisal of its Liturgy, Protestant England was left to pray till 1604.

James was now upon the throne, and the Puritans had fought hard for a *fourth* revisal of this most improvable book. The disputes they fomented, says the introduction, “rendered another revision of the Liturgy “advisable; and though the conferences held at “Hampton Court for the settlement of the controversy, “failed to produce their immediate purpose, they had “the effect of calling attention, generally, to the subject; and the king, of his own authority, but with the “approval of the ruling members of the Church, made “some important additions to the prayers.” This brought into being the *Fourth* Book of Common Prayer, in which *nothing was taken away* from that of which Catholics, it is said, might have availed themselves, even with the Pope’s permission. “In the “reign of Charles I, some *slight* alterations were also “made by royal authority; but on the accession of “his successor, it was deemed advisable to appoint a “commission, consisting of twelve Episcopalians, with “nine assistants on the one side, and *an equal number* “of *Presbyterians* on the other (!) to examine the “character and contents of the *Book of Common Prayer*.”* If ever the Book of Common Prayer

* Echard i. 793.

had a chance of being emancipated from all resemblance to the *Missal*, it had it now. But, notwithstanding that the commissioners “were on neither side deficient “in zeal or ability,” the Presbyterians could make nothing of it; the book being in fact beyond redemption, in as far as the stamp of the MASS is everywhere as distinctly visible on its leaves, as the water-mark is on a bank of England note. “The work of revision “was at length intrusted to the Convocation,” and by its advice, some few additions were made, and one collect changed. “The services for King Charles’s “martyrdom, and for the restoration, were inserted.” This was the *Fifth Book of Common Prayer of 1662*. In 1692 was added the “Gunpowder Treason” service for the 5th of November; and in 1704, a service of thanksgiving for the anniversary of the accession of the sovereign; till the Book of Common Prayer has reached the present day, as it now is in Mr Baylee’s pocket.

Will Mr Baylee ever venture to open that Book again and say that it was not taken from the Roman Missal? Why, apart altogether from historical authority upon the subject, let but the intrinsic evidence be examined which the Book bears to itself; its calendar, its denomination of Sundays and festivals, its division of services, its collects, its epistles and gospels, its responses, and its prefaces, the form of its litany, &c. &c. and but one of two conclusions can possibly be arrived at. Either the Prayer Book has come from the Missal, or the Missal from the Prayer Book;—the latter inference being the less probable of the two.

An allusion I made to one of the collects of the above Book, that of “St Michael and all Angels,” as being word for word extracted from the Roman Missal,

led Mr Baylee to protest against the Catholic doctrine of the invocation of saints. I had not said that the collect in question made this doctrine chargeable upon the Anglican Church; but simply, that if Anglicans had it not already in their own book, and found it exclusively in a Catholic Missal, it would, possibly enough, present itself to their mind, as a form of prayer arising out of said belief.* The drift of Mr Baylee's argument against the doctrine of the invocation of saints, was to show its impossibility, and was put in the shape of the following question: "How can ONE WOMAN
"listen at one and the same moment, to nine millions
"of suppliants?" Of this startlingly decorous (?) mention of the Mother of his Redeemer, and that Redeemer his God, (as Mr Baylee might have spoken without breach of courtesy, of any personally respectable apple-woman,) I shall only observe, that it is to me more a matter of pain than of surprise. The last twenty years of my life in this Protestant country, have abundantly taught me, that it is only among those who are in the habit of invoking saints, that the inspired words of the Virgin Mother of Bethlehem are not daily belied: "Behold from henceforth, all generations
"shall call me BLESSED;" said words remaining with those to whom *Scripture* is their only infallible guide, a dead letter in the first chapter of St Luke. In reference to the mighty difficulty of "one woman
"hearing at once nine millions of suppliants," the number of *nine* millions was probably fixed upon, as representing the aggregate Catholic population of the three kingdoms. Now, God be praised, it is impossible to make a Catholic Christian wear the livery of any

* Collect for St Michael and all Angels.—"O everlasting God, who hast ordained and constituted the services of angels and of men in a *wonderful order*; mercifully grant, that as thy holy angels always do Thee service in heaven, so, by thy appointment, they may succour and defend us on earth, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

one exclusive country ; and, hence, had Mr Baylee said at once an hundred and fifty millions, or more, he would undoubtedly have come much nearer to the mark. This increase of numbers, however, would not in reality have increased the difficulty, or strengthened in any way Mr Baylee's argument ; the difficulty, if any, being in the *hearing*, rather than in the *number* of suppliants heard. But, this supposed difficulty in Mr Baylee's mind, arises entirely from his applying to beings in a spiritualized state, the same laws of existence as those which rule us in our passible state. Let him but apply the same manner of argument to the miraculous appearance of the Redeemer to His apostles, " when " the doors were shut where the disciples were ;" and he must either keep the risen Saviour outside the door ; or, necessarily mistake the fact in which the miracle lay. Even bodies, existing in a spiritualized state, partake, says St Paul, of the properties of spirits. " There is a *natural* body, and there is a *spiritual* body," (1 Cor. xv. 44.) Hence, nothing more intelligible, than that a closed door, or the thickest wall that ever could have been built, should have proved no obstacle to the progress of Christ's now glorified and spiritualized flesh. The prodigy lay, in that having thus entered the closed apartment, without effort, through its own spiritual properties, it should have been invested notwithstanding with such outwardly gross appearances as to render it visible to the eye, and sensible to the touch of individuals existing in our present mortal state. The senses, then, of a glorified body, and their power of action, being essentially different from those of bodies in the state to which Mr Baylee's objection exclusively applies, it is surely embarking for the anti-

* The above apparition, by the way, proves to a demonstration, how utterly impossible it is that the Body of Christ, after the resurrection, can ever be truly and substantially present to men, under any other than a borrowed ap-

podes of reason, to insist upon arguing from the one to the other.

To return to the collect, the mention of which called forth Mr Baylee's objection; it seems to have been considered from the beginning, as one not altogether unlikely to startle pious ears, and a foot note has accordingly been appended to it, to which it may not be out of the way to direct attention here.

"It is easy to comprehend," says the Book of Common Prayer, "how God, having created men and angels so near each other in nature, *would bring them into connexion, by appointing those who occupy the higher spheres, to minister for the good of those immediately below them.*"* Now, if this be so very easy of comprehension, one does not exactly see why it should be more difficult to extend the possibility of such a rule, to those who are so much nearer still to each other in nature, as are the praying Christians of this world, and the glorified Christians in heaven; especially, as Christ assures us, that His saints are like unto the angels of God. It is not, however, quite so easy to comprehend how these angels of the higher spheres can minister for the good of those below them, unless there exist between the two some common language or medium of knowledge, by which the wants of those requiring succour or defence, can be revealed to those whose province it is to afford it. The Prayer Book states, that it is easy to comprehend "how God would bring men and angels into connexion." Yes, if their relations be *reciprocal*; but it is the reverse of easy to

pearance; and hence, how utterly childish are those objections to the Presence believed in the Catholic Eucharist, which Protestants infer from the asserted impossibility of a substance existing under outward accidents, not its own; since the Body of Christ believed to be present in the Eucharist, is that glorified and spiritualized Body, which never can become perceptible to mortal sense, under its natural accidents, or properties of being.

* See Book of Common Prayer, "St Michael and all Angels."

understand “a connexion” existing all on one side. If, then, angels and men may commune through those services of both, which God has ordained and constituted in an order that is *wonderful*! as Mr Baylee’s own Prayer Book so explicitly teaches,—why not men and saints? And, surely that “one woman,” about whose sense of hearing Mr Baylee is so sceptical, has long since been numbered among the latter!*

Moreover, whatever may be customary among Anglican Christians who use this collect, nothing is more common among Catholics who use the same, than to implore *in crowds* the prayers and assistance of St Michael. But if Saints be like unto Angels, and if St Michael can hear at once a crowd of suppliants, why not likewise the Blessed Virgin? If it be said, however, that St Michael’s nature is such that it is impossible for him to become conscious of the petitions of that multitude, then, how can St Michael hear, at one and the same moment, the thousands of inarticulate prayers, which in the secret of the sinner’s breast attest the fact of his conversion, over which St Michael and all angels are declared by Christ to rejoice? Is it easy to comprehend how even angels can rejoice over what they know not? Or, will it be replied, forsooth, that the angels do not themselves hear the prayer in question, but that its burden is revealed to them by the Almighty? This is going back to the case of the wise men, who did not receive the answer of the Jewish priests, says Mr Baylee, be-

* If Mr Baylee be a faithful expositor of the teaching of the Church of England on the score of angels, this much at least must be admitted: that, while the Church of England Prayer Book explicitly asserts, that God has brought angels and men into connexion, in an order of service that is *wonderful*; the Church itself takes away from that order the whole of its wonder; since, in reference to their connexion with the angels, there is certainly nothing very wonderful in the services of men being limited to this world,—except the absurdity of such teaching.

cause it was conveyed to them through king Herod. The word, *hearing*, in the present instance, is only a manner of speech, for want of a better term ; the question is, Are the Angels made conscious, no matter how, or by whom, that their services are asked for and required ? “Take heed,” says our blessed Lord, (Matt. xviii. 10.) “that ye despise not one of these little ones ; for I say unto you, that *in heaven, their angels do always behold* the face of my Father which is in heaven.” On which the Protestant Bible of 1802, already mentioned, comments as follows : “Since God has such concern for them, as to appoint certain of his angels to administer to, and *watch over them*, it is evidently the duty of men not to despise them.” Here, then, we have it granted, that angels who never lose sight of the face of God, who is in heaven, are, nevertheless appointed by Him to watch over the little children of this sublunary world. Can these angels be said to possess the power of fulfilling the trust for which they have been appointed—to watch over little children—if they have not the means of knowing whether these little children are saying their prayers, or repeating a story book ? In a word, is there common sense in supposing, that when men most strongly feel in need of succour or defence, and most loudly cry for it in prayer, angels, whose duty it is to watch over them, and who cannot fulfil that duty, without the actual knowledge of what these praying men are about, are yet not conscious of these prayers ? or, again, remain ignorant of the state and doings of *those immediately below them with whom they are connected*, while actually employed in affording them the succour they require ? If the angels of the Prayer Book are so nearly allied to machinery, as all this would imply, they must bear an interesting resemblance to Mr Baylee’s prophets. “Il fallait être

Hebreu," says Rousseau, "pour demander si Dieu pouvait dresser des tables dans le Désert." I shall not attempt to fathom the Hebrew sagacity of the man who first invented Mr Baylee's objection to the Invocation of Saints ; but, of a truth, his Christian philosophy cannot have been very deep.

Towards the close of the interview, Mr Baylee's manner became of a sudden more than usually impressive. For a moment, he covered his face in silence, as if asking for utterance, and then said, that what he was now about to name, had often made him shudder, for that the very thought of it was awful. He next turned to me, with look and upraised hand deprecative of forgiveness, and, as gently as under the circumstances courtesy could suggest, imparted the information—that I stood before God an oath-breaker and a perjurer ! Again Mr Baylee craved forgiveness, which a smile having granted, he added, (possibly by way of softening the indictment) that he held the charge equally applicable to every Catholic bishop, or, indeed to every Catholic in the world, who having once adhered to the creed of Pope Pius IV., ever afterwards presumed to put a sense of any kind, on any one passage of the Holy Scriptures. You have solemnly sworn, said Mr Baylee, that you never will interpret Scripture, otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Now, it is impossible to produce a text of Scripture, on the interpretation of which some Fathers have not differed in opinion from others. On this one passage, for instance,—“ If any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest ;” I will undertake to produce no less than *thirteen* different interpretations of the Fathers ; there-

fore, according to Mr Baylee, the case was disposed of, and no other verdict was possible, but that of *guilty*!

In order to relieve Mr Baylee's too sensitive mind from the horrors with which this imaginary delinquency on the part of Catholics, seems to have hitherto so painfully haunted him, as well as to make it unnecessary for him in future ever again to deliver himself, (in good faith at least) of so horrible an imputation as that with which he has here felt it a duty to asperse the overwhelming majority of the Christian world ; let me inform Mr Baylee, that in the present instance, as in a former one, his whole mistake has arisen from his having taken a *word* for his hobby, which hobby has run away with him. That hobby-word is the word "*unanimous*," to which Mr Baylee has gratuitously assigned not a different sense from that which naturally belongs to it, when accidentally met with in the solitude of a dictionary ; but a wider meaning than the construction of the sentence in which it is here incorporated, can, under the circumstances, honestly warrant. Mr Baylee is probably aware that the formula of Catholic belief commonly called the Creed of Pope Pius IV., is an explicit and succinct summary of the doctrines contained in the canons of the Council of Trent, and intended to serve as an authoritative expression of the faith held by that Council ; nor can he dispute the fact that this same creed has ever since been acknowledged by the Catholic Church to be, in matters of belief, a faithful exposition of the mind of the Tridentine Synod ; neither adding to nor taking from the breadth or meaning of its decrees, but strictly and simply embodying the sense of the doctrinal definitions of that assembly, in the declaratory form of an Act of Faith. To the original decrees, then, of the Council itself, must we go for the true sense of the creed of Pope Pius IV., wherever its meaning may be open to a doubt ; and

by the unmistakeable definitions of that Council must the creed of Pope Pius be exclusively and finally interpreted. I beg, then, to refer Mr Baylee to the Acts of the Fourth Session of the Council of Trent, where, under the head “*Decretum de editione et usu sacrorum librorum*,” he will find the following words :—

“*Præterea, ad coercenda petulantia ingenia, decernit, ut nemo, suæ prudentiæ innixus, in rebus fidei, et morum, ad ædificationem doctrinæ Christianæ pertinentium, sacram Scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens, contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum, ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari audeat.*”

“Furthermore, in order to restrain petulant spirits, “it, (the holy synod) decrees, that no one, relying on “his own skill, shall,—in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, “—wresting the sacred scripture to his own senses, “presume to interpret the said sacred scripture *contrary* to that sense which holy mother Church— “whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy scriptures,—hath held, and doth “hold ; or, even *contrary* to the *unanimous* consent of “the Fathers.”*

The meaning of the Council is here so indisputably clear, that it baffles all attempt at quirk or quibble. That meaning does not involve the absurdity in which Mr Baylee has been pleased to infeof us, of never being at liberty to attach a definite sense to any single passage of Scripture, until we have ascertained the fact that no one Father has interpreted said passage differently

* Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, &c., by the Rev. J. Waterworth, p. 19.

from another ; or, that the alternative is perjury ; but, simply and *only*, a prohibition, in matters relating to faith and morals, to interpret scripture in a way that contradicts the unanimous exposition which may have already been given of it by the Fathers. In other words, that whenever the Christian writers, holding communion with the Church, during the first six centuries, (for these, strictly speaking, are “ the Fathers,”) have been unanimous in the interpretation they have given to any text of scripture, bearing upon what a Christian is bound to believe or practise ; Catholics are not at liberty to adopt a *contrary* interpretation, for the sufficient reason, that on none of these points are the above writers, in such scriptural interpretations, anything but at one with the teaching of the Catholic Church as to faith and morals. Of the truth of this latter fact, the Catholic Church has surely as good a right as Mr Baylee, to make herself the judge ; and, when proclaiming her judgment, as strong a claim as he can show to the belief of the world. Should Mr Baylee, however, not deem it presumptuous to think otherwise, this would not at any rate affect the *meaning* of the above decree.

Let us now turn to the words of Pope Pius’ creed. They are these. “ Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto ; nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimum consensum Patrum accipiam, et interpretabor.”*

“ I also admit the holy Scripture, according to that sense, which our holy mother Church, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures, hath held, and doth hold ;

* Bulla S. N. D. D. Pii, Divina Providentia Papæ Quarti, &c., Catechismus Concilii Tridentini.

“neither will I ever receive and interpret the same, otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.”

I would grieve to cast the shadow of suspicion on Mr Baylee's sincerity. The unconscious habit of taking refuge in subtilties, when sound argument fails, may find its way, I can conceive, into the most upright mind, when a fight is to be made *pro aris et focis*,—for all that religious education and the ties of a lifetime have taught it to venerate, and endeared to its recollections; while, again, of no Christian man believing with St Paul that politeness is a virtue, can I conceive that he would court the opportunity of entering his neighbour's house, for the purpose of informing him that he is an oath-breaker, and a perjurer; unless when proved to do so by very strong convictions indeed. But, having made this large allowance, I maintain, and I shall prove, that it is altogether impossible for any man not clothed in a triple armour of the most blind and inconvincible prejudice, to put an *honest* construction upon the word “unanimous,” as it occurs in the creed, that will give it a sense different from the exclusive meaning which undeniably belongs to it in the Tridentine decree. My argument is as follows :—

The creed of Pope Pius IV., as a declaratory form of Catholic belief, is universally admitted to be strictly and exclusively, an exposition of the doctrines defined by the Council of Trent, and an unimpeachably true exposition of the same.—Now, the Council of Trent never defined any such doctrine as that of which Mr Baylee charges the expression on the creed of Pope Pius, in virtue of the meaning he has attached to the words, “otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.” Therefore, the interpretation put upon these words by Mr Baylee, in a declaratory

formula, purporting and acknowledged to be exclusively and truly an exposition of the mind of Trent, is not the interpretation which legitimately belongs to them. There is both in nature and extent a difference wide as the sea, between the prohibition which forbids to interpret Scripture "*contrary* to the unanimous consent of the Fathers," and *that* only when question of faith and morals; and the prohibition as Englished by Mr Baylee, which forbids to interpret Scripture at all, under any circumstances, until the unanimous consent of the Fathers has been ascertained, for thus it is that Mr Baylee reads the words, "otherwise than according to." Now, it is the *former only* of these two prohibitions, which the council of Trent has embodied in its decree. Of no other, then, can a Catholic be, in justice, made to speak, when avowedly declaring his adhesion to the doctrinal definitions of that Council. To say the contrary, is openly to assert, that the Creed of Pius IV. is not a faithful exposition of the Canons of Trent,—an accusation never brought against it yet, amidst all the rubbish that has been heaped upon that creed in the shape of censure, by its most orthodox defamers.

Again, apart from the proclamation of its adherence to the faith already borne witness to in the Nicene Creed, the Council of Trent never having defined anything in its doctrinal canons, but what was condemnatory of some opposite doctrine, as held by the reformers; it follows that each and every doctrinal definition of that Council, must find its converse proposition in the condemned doctrines of the Reformation. Now, what becomes of Mr Baylee's interpretation of the creed, if tested by this rule; and he cannot question its fairness? Under pain of perjury, says Mr Baylee, a Christian must not, in any circumstances,

attach a definite meaning to a text of Scripture, until he shall have previously ascertained the fact, that no one Father has ever differed from another, in his interpretation of that text. The converse of this is : It is perfectly allowable for a Christian to attach a definite meaning to a text of Scripture, under any circumstances, without having previously ascertained the fact, that all the Fathers are unanimous in their interpretation of the same. Now, will Mr Baylee point out a single page in the whole range of the Tridentine discussions, from whence it will appear that this last proposition was ever visited by the Council with the slightest blame, as contradicting the doctrine of the Catholic Church ; or will he name the reformer who was ever condemned for holding it ? Then, the Council never censured this last proposition. But it must have done so, if the creed of Pope Pius be a faithful exposition of the mind of Trent, and if Mr Baylee be a faithful interpreter of the creed. Therefore, once more, Mr Baylee's interpretation of the creed is at total variance with its only possible true meaning, viz : the meaning of the Council whose definitions it declares.

Finally, if done with advertency, it would be manifestly dishonest to insist upon culling the true interpretation of any sentence, from a portion only of the sentence to be interpreted. "A sentence," says Lowth, "is an assemblage of words, expressed in proper form, and ranged in proper order, *and concurring to make a complete sense.*" Ere it is possible, then, to extract from any sentence, the complete sense which it makes (and without that complete sense, we cannot surely master its true sense,) the sentence must be taken, not in bits, but in its entirety, and be dealt with as a whole. This also, it must be allowed, is a fair rule by which to test the justice and accuracy of Mr Baylee's inter-

pretation of the Creed of Pope Pius. Let it therefore be tried by this rule.

The sentence of Pope Pius' Creed is this. "I also admit the Holy Scripture, according to that sense, which our Holy Mother Church, TO WHOM IT BELONGS to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, HATH HELD, AND DOT H OLD ; neither will I ever receive and interpret the same, otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."—Now, from the only meaning that can be given to the words of the above sentence, as a whole, it follows that whoever, believing the interpreting of scripture to belong by right to the Church, admits said scripture in the sense which the Church hath held and doth hold ; admits it undeniably in a definite sense, and, independently altogether of the interpretation of the Fathers, unanimous, or not unanimous :—the Fathers being in reality but witnesses to the interpreting of the Church which existed in their day, or previous to it ; not themselves the rightful and final judges of the true sense of scripture ; as Littleton, Coke, Blackstone, and others may be held witnesses of the sense which England put upon her laws in their day, or previous to it ; though not, strictly speaking, the rightful interpreters of those laws themselves.* From the fact, however, of the Fathers being witnesses to the interpretation put upon scripture, by the Church at the various periods of her early existence ; it clearly follows, that, whenever their testimony agrees unanimously as to the interpretation given to scripture by the Church on all matters involving faith

* The juridical Commentators here mentioned, had no inherent right to fix upon the law of England any sense which to them seemed best ; since they had neither made the law, nor been vested with any commission to determine unchangeably its meaning. The Church claims such a right in reference to the law divinely revealed, not of course because that law originated with Her ; but, because she has been invested unto the end of time, with a divinely spoken commission, to teach all nations what said law enjoins or forbids.

or morals; such evidence affords a proof of what the Church during the first six centuries did teach from scripture on all subjects of Christian belief and Christian practice. Hence, whoever professes, in point of faith and morals, to admit the scripture in that sense only which the Church "*hath held and doth hold,*" cannot admit it "*otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*" To force upon the words of the Creed any meaning different from this, is to make both the Council and its Creed lay down in one and the same sentence, firstly, that the Church *alone* has the right to interpret the holy scriptures, "*cujus est judicare;*" and, secondly, that the Fathers have *an equal right*, save that it is to be exercised in common, "*nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimum consensum Patrum accipiam.*" Were it allowable to introduce into the consideration of a subject in itself so serious, a ludicrous elucidation of the nonsense which this would be making both council and creed to speak, (and yet who can help the elucidation of nonsense being ridiculous?) it could only be found in the story of the two mastiffs, Cæsar and Pompey, so like in appearance to each other that it was impossible to distinguish them, especially Pompey. For in this manner, we would have two *per se* rightful interpreters of scripture, the Church and the Fathers, one of whom would be the only one; yet, so like in authority, that it would be impossible to distinguish the one from the other, especially the Church. As this, however, would be the undeniably absurd result that would follow, were Mr Baylee correct in the interpretation he has thought fit to put upon the above words of Pope Pius' Creed; it seems more natural at once to hold that Mr Baylee is mistaken.

The only exception that Mr Baylee could take to the above reasoning, would be, to deny the fact that the

Fathers ever were unanimous on the score of that sense of scripture which “the Church hath held, and doth hold.” This, again, is a different question, not affecting the stringency of the argument, in as far as it goes to establish the meaning to be attributed to the creed ; but a subject for historical investigation, not necessary to be entered upon here, since it was not inquired into during the interview with Mr Baylee.

The last assertion of Mr Baylee, which I have here to notice, is the one implied in his declaration, that he was prepared to show from the 12th Canon of the Sixth Session of the Council of Trent, that the Fathers of said Council had anathematized St Augustine.

The canon alluded to is the following :—“ Si quis dixerit, fidem justificantem nihil aliud esse quam fiduciam Divinæ misericordiæ, peccata remittentis propter Christum ; vel etiam fiduciam solam esse, qua justificamur, anathema sit.”* “If any one saith, that justifying faith is nothing else but confidence in the Divine mercy, which remits sins for Christ’s sake ; or, that this confidence alone is that whereby we are justified, let him be anathema.”

This declaration by Mr Baylee, necessarily implies the assertion that St Augustine held, upon the subject of justification, a doctrine different from that which it seemed good to the Catholic Church, as assembled at Trent, to define. Mr Baylee did not proceed to demonstrate this assertion ; he simply made the declaration which contains it. It is impossible for me, then, to engage in actual conflict with Mr Baylee’s invisible corps de reserve ; or, in plain English, to undertake to refute that which never was spoken. This much, however, I will make bold to attempt ; I will presume to prove, that had Mr Baylee ventured to step one

* Concilii Tridentini Canones et Decreta.

inch beyond his threat, and to have spoken at all in its support, he could have advanced nothing but what must, as usual, have led to establish the reverse of what he would have others believe.

Ere entering, however, on the vindication of St Augustine, or rather, on that of the Tridentine Council, let me premise with the remark, that the doctrine of the Catholic Church as to justification, is so inseparably allied to her doctrine upon grace, that it is simply impossible to be orthodox upon the latter, and heretical as to the former. In other words, whoever holds Catholic teaching on the subject of grace, must hold Catholic teaching on that of justification. The reason is, that according to that teaching, justification is in itself the work of grace; while grace again is the means through which justification is effected. This much being carefully kept in view, I shall ground my first proof that the Council of Trent could not have considered St Augustine to have erred as to the doctrine of justification, on a principle of common sense.

That principle is the one urged by St Augustine himself against the Pelagians, when they quoted St Chrysostome as having believed differently from the Church of St Augustine's day, as to the matter of grace and of original sin. His argument against Julian was simply this:—We know what the universal belief of the Church on the above points is at the present time, and we know, moreover, that the authority of St Chrysostome, as a true and faithful doctor of the Church, is, as it has ever been up to our day, beyond the reach of suspicion. Had, indeed, St Chrysostome ventured to teach differently upon the above subjects from all the rest of his brother bishops, with all the respect due to his name, his solitary teaching we would be bound to reject; but that he ever did thus teach, is

impossible, since, in that case, "*he never could have continued to be of such great authority in the Church.*"* Now, Mr Baylee's assertion in reference to St Augustine, and his alleged condemnation by the Council of Trent, affords fair scope for an exactly similar argument. We know that upon the doctrine of justifying grace, the universal teaching of the Catholic Church in this our own day, is, in every respect, the same as that defined by the Council of Trent; and we know likewise, that of all the Fathers, of either East or West, without a single exception, there is none whose teaching on the subject of that grace which justifies, is held in higher veneration throughout the Catholic Church at this hour, than St Augustine. But had this same teaching been openly branded as heretical by the decrees of a General Council, as it must have been, were it true that it came under the ban of the canon quoted above, "*he (St Augustine) never could have continued to be of such great authority in the Church,*" on the subject of justifying grace, as he still is. Therefore, Mr Baylee must be mistaken. The Council of Trent, in its 12th canon upon justification, never dreamed of anathematising the great and learned St Augustine.

Let the matter, however, be looked into more narrowly still. According to the Protestant doctrine on justification, justice is only *imputed* to man, not *inherent* in his soul. His sins are not taken away, but covered by the righteousness of Christ; as a leper might be swathed in the purple of a prince. No change of soul is implied necessarily suggestive of good works; but what constitutes justification, is that act of faith, as it is called, by which a man indubitably believes that his sins are forgiven him, through the merits of Jesus Christ. This belief, say the first reformers, is as a *hand* by which we apply to ourselves the

† Liber I. contra Jul. cap. vi. n. 23.

imputed justice of the Redeemer; and hence the modern Protestant phraseology of "laying hold of Christ." Such is the doctrine condemned in the 12th canon of the Tridentine Synod, as referred to by Mr Baylee. "If any one saith, that justifying faith is nothing else but confidence in the Divine mercy, which remits sins for Christ's sake; or, that this confidence alone is that whereby we are justified, let him be anathema."

The Catholic doctrine upon justification, again, teaches that sin is taken away, that justice is inherent in the soul, and that the soul of man is interiorly changed, and moved to the fulfilment of the law of God, through the performance of good works. Now, if we turn to the writings of St Augustine on these three points, we shall find him teaching uniformly one and the same doctrine.—That this most Catholic Bishop believed that justifying grace necessarily removed sin from the soul, not as to its penalty only, but in its guilt, is evident from what he teaches of that grace as imparted in baptism. The Pelagians objected to him that according to his doctrine, all sins were not remitted in baptism, were not taken away by it, but in a manner pared off, as the hair is removed, leaving the root still in the head. To this he indignantly replies, "Who but an infidel would say this? our doctrine, therefore is, that baptism gives the remission of all sins, and *takes them away*, not paring them off only." "*Quis hoc nisi infidelis affirmet? Dicimus ergo baptismus dare omnium indulgentiam peccatorum, et auferre crimina, non radere.*"* As to the Catholic doctrine of the *inherence* of justifying grace, St Augustine teaches it most unequivocally in many parts of his works. Let the following serve as an instance of that undeniable teaching. In the twenty-third of his letters, that great doctor speaks thus of the working of the

* Contra duas epist. Pelag. Lib. i. cap. 13, n. 20.

Holy Spirit within us. The Spirit, says he, working interiorly the benefit of grace, undoing the tie of guilt, reconciling what is good in nature, regenerates man. "Spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiæ, solvens "vinculum culpæ, reconcilians bonum naturæ, regen-
 "erat hominem."* Again, in his treatise on the remission of sins, &c. he says, God gives to the faithful a most hidden grace of His spirit, which in an unseen manner, he also infuses into infants. "Dat etiam sui
 "spiritus occultissimam fidelibus gratium, quam laten-
 "ter infundit et parvulis."† And in the following chapter of the same book, "we read," he says, "that they who believe in Christ are justified in Him, because of an unseen communication and inspiration of spiritual grace." "Legimus in Christo justificari qui credunt in
 "eum, propter occultam communicationem et inspira-
 "tionem gratiæ spiritualis."‡ Finally, on the score of the change wrought in the soul by this justifying grace, by which it is moved to do good, and to fulfil God's law, the following words of Melancthon speak volumes as to the Catholic orthodoxy of St Augustine. Writing to a friend on the matter of justification, he tells him once and again, that what prevents him from taking a correct view of the question, is, that he does not sufficiently divest himself of *the fond imaginings of St Augustine*, and that he must entirely turn away from *the imagining* of that Father—the imagining of St Augustine being as follows: "It is," says Melancthon, "the imagining of our being held for just through the
 "accomplishment of the law, which the Holy Ghost
 "effects within us."§ If, therefore, we look to what essentially constitutes the doctrine of the Catholic Church, on the subject of justifying grace, in contra-

* Epist. xxiii., or xeviii.

† Lib. i. de. pecc. mer., &c. cap. 9. n. 10.

‡ Ibid. c. 10, n. 11.

§ See Appendix, I.

distinction to that of Protestants on the same question, and then compare said doctrine with what St Augustine teaches on the same subject, it cannot but be admitted, that it would have been on the part of the Council of Trent an act of open insanity, to have anathematized the writings of the bishop of Hippo.

Is there nothing, then, absolutely in all the works of St Augustine, to which such a meaning might be given, as would, seemingly, bring some of the words of that Father to militate against the doctrine defined by the Council of Trent? Yes, there may be ; but only such as St Augustine himself had been the first to condemn, and to recall. Before his elevation to the episcopacy, when as yet, as he informs us, he had made but an insufficient study of the difficult subject of grace, and ere the dispute concerning the Pelagian heresy had called for a greater degree of precision in treating of Divine grace, St Augustine informs us in the first book of his retracts, as well as in that on predestination, that he had fallen into some erroneous notions on faith, as being in itself a gift of God, and on the election of God's grace ; which erroneous notions he was the first to refute and to retract,* and concerning which, as still held among, and objected to him as his own by the semi-Pelagians, he says, that they continue to hold these errors, because having read his books, they had neglected to profit along with him. "In qua sententia istos
"fratres nostros esse nunc video ; quia non sicut legere
"libros meos, ita etiam in his curaverunt proficere
"mecum." Whether such be the works of St Augustine to which Mr Baylee intended to have referred, I have, of course, no means of knowing, as he did not actually make the reference ; but if so, and there are

* "I had not yet investigated with sufficient diligence, I had not yet discovered the nature of the election of grace. *Nondum diligentius quæsieram, nec adhuc inveneram, qualis sit electio gratiæ.*

no others to which he possibly could have appealed, with any chance of giving even a plausible colouring to his threat ; I have only to observe, that, had he referred to these early works of St Augustine, he would have proved nothing to the point ; but have only laid himself open to the reproach addressed above to the semi-Pelagians ; that, while reading the books of this great Father, he had neglected to keep pace with him in his study of divine truth.

Can it really be necessary to remind Mr Baylee that so far from ever having been condemned at Trent, on the subject of justifying grace, St Augustine cannot but have been held by the Fathers of that Council as the highest landmark, and the brightest beacon in the whole of Catholic tradition, to which they could look back for the evidence of primitive belief upon this same doctrine? Was not St Augustine for twenty long years, the authorised mouthpiece, as it were, of the whole Catholic world, on this very subject? Was it not of St Augustine, now that God had called to Himself, and that at the urgent request of St Prosperus and St Hilary, Rome had to give judgment on the orthodoxy of his teaching, that the Pope St Celestine declared “ the most distant rumour of suspicion had never attached to his name ; “ *nec eum sinistrae suspicionis saltem rumor aspersionis*, while his predecessors “ in the chair of Peter had ever ranked him among “ the most excellent teachers of the Church ?” * Was it not of St Augustine that the great St Jerome said : “ After what has been written by this holy and eloquent bishop, it is no longer necessary for me to refute the Pelagians ?” Has not the orthodoxy of St Augustine on the doctrines of grace and free-will been proclaimed alike by council after council, and pope after pope ?—How, then, can Mr Baylee seriously take

* Epist. Cælest. Papæ pro Prosp. et Hil.

upon him to say that St Augustine was anathematized by the Council of Trent? The assertion would be monstrous, could it escape from being ridiculous, in the eyes of all who know that the writings of St Augustine were in truth the source from whence the divines of Trent culled the very words of that Council's canons and decrees ; or, as Petavius writes, in which after the Scriptures, they sought for their rule both of thought and of expression, "*sentienti formam et loquendi regulam.*" One word more and I have done. After summing up the whole doctrine of the Council of Trent on the subject of justification, Pallavicino remarks, "Tutti questi decreti son confermati, anzi tessuti, con parole della Scrittura e de' Santi, et *specialmente d' Agos-*"
 "TINO."*

I have now, to the best of my recollection, reviewed every subject touched upon during the conference of which the preceding pages are intended to furnish a summary ; and have only to add, that, should any expression have escaped me, seeming to bear the impress of severity, it must be attributed to the fact, that while "Charity is kind," Logic is inexorable. The golden rule of St Jerome, however, will, I trust, ever be mine ; "*Diligite homines, persequimini errores* ; or, while the one hand is mercilessly armed against his error, let the other be ever stretched forth in good fellowship to the man. May I venture, then, in conclusion, to express the hope, that the prospect of having to obey the more pleasing half of the precept is yet before me, and that the day will come, when they who were present toge-

* Istoria del Concilio di Trento, Parte prima. Libro viii. capo xiv.

ther in conflict on the 29th of August last, may meet in the unity of the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, to smile over the controversy to which their first interview has given rise.

I have the honour to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's

Most obedient humble Servant in Christ,

✠ JAMES GILLIS,

COADJUTOR CATHOLIC BISHOP
OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT IN SCOTLAND.

Edinburgh, 9th October, 1850.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

THE following passage from Melanchthon so unmistakeably identifies the teaching of St Augustine upon Justifying Grace, with that of the Council of Trent upon the same subject, that it is given here in full.

DE MODO CORAM DEO JUSTIFICANDI.

CUIDAM AMICO,—Tuam epistolam longiusculam accepi, quæ fuit luculentissima : teq ; oro, ut sæpe et multis scribas. De fide teneo, quid te exerceat. Tu adhuc hæres in Augustini imaginatione, qui eò pervenit, ut neget rationis justiciam : et rectè sentit. Deinde imaginatur, nos justos reputari propter hanc impletionem legis, quam efficit in nobis Spiritus Sanctus.....Augustinus non satisfacit Pauli sententiæ, etsi propius accedit quàm Scholastici. Etego cito Augustinum, propter publicam de eo persuasionem : cùm tamen non satis explicet fidei justiciam. Crede mihi, mi amice, magna et obscura controversia est de justitia fidei : quam ita rectè intelliges, si in totum removeris oculos à lege, et imaginatione Augustini de impletionem legis : et defixeris animum prorsus in gratuitam promissionem, ut sentias, quòd propter promissionem seu propter Christum justì, hoc est accepti sumus, et pacem invenimus.....Si cogitabis animum revocandum esse ab Augustini imaginatione, facilè intelliges causam.*

* Epistolarum D. Philippi Melanchthonis Farrago, &c. Basileæ, 1565, p. 81.

II.

The following is a reprint of the public correspondence that has passed between the Rev. Mr Baylee and myself, in the columns of the MORNING HERALD. Mr Baylee's letters, as will be found on perusal, profess to be an answer to my "Review," &c. My replies will speak for themselves. For greater facility of reference, the passages in Mr Baylee's letters, alluded to in mine, are given in italics.

1.

To the RIGHT REV. DR GILLIS,
Roman Catholic Bishop in Edinburgh.

RIGHT REV. SIR,

Recent events, some of which have obtained but too painful notoriety, compel me to address you through the public press, and to bring the doctrines which you uphold, and the line of conduct which you and those who act with you, have chosen to pursue, to the bar of public opinion. It is not to be expected that we shall have aggressions made upon the flock of Christ committed to our charge, without our standing forward in their defence, and obeying the apostolic injunction to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints."

I do not complain, sir, of any one's endeavouring to diffuse those opinions which he believes to be true. On the contrary, I think every man is bound to do so. He incurs, indeed, a heavy responsibility that he has taken all the pains in his power to ascertain the truth of what he believes before he endeavours to win over others to his views.

In this respect, Romish ecclesiastics in this country are a living witness to the manifest superiority of the blessed liberty of Protestantism over Roman intolerance. The whole world has seen in the recent act of the Bishop of Rome how a Protestant nation can indignantly maintain her religion and liberties without the smallest personal violence to the men who pretend to a Divine commission to endeavour to subvert both.

Suppose the cases were reversed, and that an organised body of English ecclesiastics were sent to Rome, publicly commissioned to insult all its authorities, secular and sacred, and actively endeavouring to subvert the established religion, how would they be received? And think you that not only the English nation, but also the whole world, will not see and recognise, yes, and honour, too, the difference between us?

The aroused spirit of the English nation will convince the world that the mild tolerance of our laws has not arisen from indifference to our religion, but from our deep conviction that its intrinsic truth and power will sustain any assault upon it, and from our sacred respect for liberty of action and thought to the utmost extent compatible with social order.

It is a noble lesson, sir, which elevates our Church and our nation to a pitch of glory never before attained by man. It is the harbinger and the pledge of the full and final triumph of England's Church and religion over all the intolerance and the latitudinarianism of the world. She is now passing through the discipline which is fitted of God to make her indeed Christ's witness to the whole world, the dispenser and the example of his truth in all its blessed purity.

I have been led to these observations in consequence of recent events

which have brought you and me into a connection, which the path you have marked out for yourself compels me to make public.

On the 24th of August last, a noble earl, to whom I have the honour to be chaplain, received a letter from his eldest son, announcing his intention of seeking admission into the Church of Rome within a few days from the date of his letter. His Lordship wrote to me to render him what assistance I could on so unhappy an occasion. I went to him without delay, and we went together to Edinburgh, accompanied by another member of his family. We could hardly believe that in the short space of less than seven weeks a person could publicly stand forward and declare his unalterable affection for the Apostolic Church in God's mercy established in this kingdom; and then, without time for inquiry, much less for study, renounce his allegiance to her, and unite himself with her bitterest enemies. We arrived in Edinburgh on Tuesday night, the 27th of August, and the next morning found, to our inexpressible grief, that such was the indecent haste of Romish ecclesiastics to seize upon what they considered a prize, that he had been already received into the Church of Rome, by what upon all Catholic principles was a sacrilegious profanation of the holy ordinance of baptism, and was thus taught to trample upon all authority, human and divine.

It is very painful for me to speak thus of one whom I still consider my friend, and with whom I expect to be again united in a worship purified from the novelties and idolatries in which he is now unhappily entangled.

I had an interview with him on the afternoon of that day, and am glad to be able to say that there was on both sides the cordiality of kind feeling which will, I earnestly hope, never be interrupted. *I entreated of him to yield to a parent's earnest desire that he would procure an interview between you and me, in order to examine the correctness of the paper of "Reasons for Catholicity," which he had sent to his family as the ground of the step which he had taken, and which he had declared to be the result of much study and prayer. He very willingly consented to it, and immediately called upon you. He returned to us in the evening, telling us that you would be ready to receive us the next day. He left his paper of reasons with you, that you might be prepared to enter upon the subject.*

We waited upon you the next day (Thursday, August 29,) at ten o'clock, and had a conference of three hours. There were five persons present—the Earl himself, his two children, you and I. The Earl commenced by saying that his son, having taken the step he did, he (the father) felt that the reasons alleged in the paper were so weak that he had felt very anxious they should be examined in conference between me (his chaplain) and you (the Roman Catholic bishop who had received him.)

You expressed your willingness to do so, declaring, however, that you had not read the paper, and were in no way responsible for it; that Lord ——'s step was entirely his own, and that you had asked him whether there was any Anglican clergyman that he wished to consult before being admitted into your communion.

We observed that we did not want to hold you responsible for the paper, because we knew that no one who had any character to lose for theological knowledge could allow himself to be so. I added that my great desire was to show Lord —— that the reasons, which he declared to be the result of much thought and prayer, and to be sufficient to make him take a step which nothing but a Divine command could warrant, were so inaccurate that I felt persuaded you, as a Roman Catholic Bishop, would be obliged to give them up as untenable. I endeavoured to impress upon Lord —— that if that paper were untenable, he was loudly called upon to reconsider the step which he had just taken.

After a few preliminary observations, I read the whole paper, noting down the parts to which I objected. After the reading of the paper we proceeded to examine those parts seriatim.

We had gone over about a third of them, when you declared the paper to be inaccurate, and gave it up as untenable!

I had thus accomplished the primary object of our conference. Lord —— had the pain of hearing his newly-chosen guide compelled to give up, as untenable, the very paper upon which he had declared that he had taken so unhappy a step.

We then proceeded to discuss the question of the infallibility of the Church, and continued our conference for two hours longer. At its close, I said that Lord —— had promised to carry on a correspondence with me upon the whole question, and I expressed a hope that you would assist him on the Romish side. You pleaded want of time, but named a priest, whom you declared to be very competent to the task. We parted on the mutual understanding that there was to be such a correspondence.

In the evening of that day, Lord —— acknowledged to me that I had the best of the argument, but attributed it to your ill health, and not being accustomed to an oral controversy. I said that I wished the whole subject to be fully investigated; that I did not wish to claim any victory in an extempore controversy; and that I hoped he would require from you the aid of the best trained Roman Catholic controversialist that you could procure. We parted with a mutual good feeling, which I trust will never be interrupted. Immediately on my return home, I wrote a memorandum of the whole conference from the notes which I had taken during its progress. I also wrote a paper on infallibility, which I sent to Lord —— to submit to the animadversions of the antagonist selected by you. That paper was sent on the 4th of September. After waiting in anxious expectation for the promised answer, I received from Lord —— on the 5th of November a printed pamphlet with your name attached to it. That pamphlet purported to be an account of our conference. I was indeed surprised that you would venture to print such an account without giving me the opportunity of seeing whether it was a correct statement. I was the more surprised as you acknowledge in the pamphlet that you had taken no notes, but that you knew we had. No wonder, sir, that it is printed for private circulation. As little is it to be wondered at that it contains four characteristics:—

1. *It represents me as saying what I did not say.*
2. *It does not state what I did say.*
3. *It has many things on your side which you did not say.*
4. *It omits many things that you did say.*

I shall take the liberty of printing it in parallel columns with my account of the same conference, attested by the two noble individuals who were present at it, and whose high character raises them far above all suspicion of untruth.

A true judgment can thus be formed; and I hope the public attention thus drawn to the subject will obtain for Lord —— the aid which had been promised to him in the discussion of the momentous differences between the Churches of England and Rome.

The kindness of the Editor of the London Morning Herald, has opened the columns of that valuable Journal to the controversy. If Rome believe that she has truth on her side, if she do not fear the light of fair discussion, she has an opportunity, from the rank of the parties concerned, and from the respectability of the Journal which is opened to the object, of obtaining for her doctrines a degree of attention which, had she truth on her side, would be invaluable to her.

On my part, Sir, I do not undertake so weighty a task without a trembling sense of where alone grace and strength can be found. *My cause is the cause of Christ my Saviour.* His holy truth is impugned, the power of His cross is denied, and the individual teaching of his Spirit is rejected, by the modern Church of Rome. It is, indeed, an honour to be permitted to stand forward

in defence of those blessed truths. In my next letter I shall give so much of both accounts of the conference as the editor can find room for.

I have now given a plain statement of facts. May the Great Head of the Church direct and guide this controversy to the advancement of his truth, and the promotion of his glory, in the good of many souls.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir,

Your faithful Servant,

JOSEPH BAYLEE,

Principal of St Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

St Aidan's, Nov. 11.

2.

TO THE RIGHT REV. DR GILLIS,

ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP IN EDINBURGH.

RIGHT REV. SIR,

I now proceed to redeem my promise of laying before the public the account of our conference, as printed and privately circulated by you, compared,—shall I say contrasted?—with the account of the same drawn up by me, and attested by the two noble individuals who accompanied me. Before I do so I must beg public attention to the following facts:—

1. In your introduction you say of yourself—"I was the only one, who, on that occasion, used neither pen nor pencil; but, on the breaking up of the conference, I took note, to the best of my recollection, OF ALL THAT HAD PASSED, and submitted my jottings at the time to Lord——, who pronounced them to be correct. By these I shall now be guided."

2. *I drew up a paper on Infallibility, giving a statement of the arguments propounded by you at our conference, with the replies that I had given, and a great many Scripture references. That paper was sent to Lord—— on the 3d of September, and I have his Lordship's letter telling me that he sent it without delay to you, adding that you had promised to answer and confute all the arguments which I had employed on the 29th of August.*

3. *Your printed reply is dated the 9th of October. You therefore had my paper in your possession for more than a month before that date.*

As I shall print that paper, the public will be able to judge whether I am correct in charging you with a suppression of what I really said, and of a mis-statement of my views in what you allege that I said.

These, Sir, are very grave charges. They are true ones; the evidence upon which they rest you cannot deny. I make them under a deeply-solennized feeling. We are both writing in the presence of the God of truth and holiness, to whom we shall have to give a solemn account in the last day.

Again, you say that you took note, to the best of your recollection, OF ALL THAT HAD PASSED, and you profess to be guided by these "jottings."

Can it be, Sir, that you forgot that we met together to discuss Lord——'s "Thoughts upon Catholicity," and that we spent a whole hour upon that paper, after which you gave it up as inaccurate and untenable?

It is for you to account why your narrative of our conference makes no reference to that paper.

You say, "The first point of Catholic belief challenged by Mr Baylee

was the supremacy of St Peter, and his presidency over the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem."

I have the evidence of Lord ——'s paper to prove that such was not the fact, but that you have suppressed important matter, which occupied us more than half-an-hour.

The following is my memorandum of the first part of our discussion, of the accuracy of which I have the evidence of Lord ——'s "Thoughts upon Catholicity," and the authentication already alluded to :—

MEMORANDUM of a discussion between the Roman Catholic Bishop in Edinburgh, and the Rev. JOSEPH BAYLEE, at the Roman Catholic Convent in Edinburgh, on Thursday, August 29, 1850:

The Earl of ——, Lady ——, and Mr Baylee went, by appointment, to the convent, at ten a.m., and were shewn into what appeared to be the bishop's study.

The bishop opened the conference by assuring Lord —— that he had had no connection with Lord ——'s change, further than one conversation when he (Lord ——) had called on him, and that he quite entered into what his feelings as a parent must be.

Lord —— told the bishop that he had no complaint whatever to make against him ; that he was aware his son had called in the first instance, but he (Lord ——) was very anxious that Lord —— should have the opportunity of having his written reasons for joining the Church of Rome discussed with the bishop by his friend and chaplain, Mr Baylee ; that he was fully persuaded Lord —— had acted thoroughly conscientiously ; and that he was assured the same conscientious feeling would bring him back again, when he discovered the insufficiency and erroneousness of his alleged reasons.

Mr Baylee concurred in assuring the bishop that none of us made any charge against him ; that we had met to discuss the correctness of Lord ——'s paper, which Lord —— would excuse his saying was so weak that a child could answer it.

The bishop disclaimed all connection with the paper ; said that he had only seen it the evening before, and had not had time to read it.

Mr Baylee said, he by no means held the Bishop responsible for the paper, but as it contained Lord and Lady ——'s reasons for secession from the Church of England, and was declared by them to be the result of much study and prayer, Mr Baylee was anxious to have the opportunity of showing Lord —— that the paper was full of errors.

*It was then agreed that the paper should be read, and that its arguments should be examined *seriatim*.*

Mr Baylee commenced by saying it would prevent misunderstanding if he first stated the points in debate. It was not the catholicity of the Church, nor her authority, but her infallibility, and the historical and other errors in the paper.

Mr Baylee stated what he believed to be the Catholic Church. He said that Christ not only gave us a religion, but that he also founded a Church. Over that Church the twelve apostles presided, and afterwards St Paul, in union with them ; and that the present Catholic Church is the lawful succession of the whole apostolate, with the people under their obedience.

To this definition the Bishop assented.

Mr Baylee then declared that he acknowledged the authority of the Church, that it had the same sort of Divine right over him that a parent has ; but, that, as parental authority is not infallible, although of Divine appointment, so

he believed of the Catholic Church. He begged, therefore, that the Bishop would bear in mind that any assertion of authority for the Church was not controverting Mr B.'s principles, unless he claimed infallible authority.

After this preliminary statement, Mr B. read Lord ——'s paper, which was then examined in order.

The first point was the unity of the Church, asserted from Eph. iv. 4, &c. "One body and one spirit," &c. And 1 Cor. xii. 12—27.—"For as the body is one," &c. This Mr B. did not dispute, although he would not altogether admit the inference that "any part that cuts itself off from communion with the body ceases to belong to it, and to be a partaker of the gifts bestowed on it."

The next point was the proof offered for the infallibility of the Church:—
1. Faith and baptism necessary to salvation. 2. Protestant error that "the depositary of Christ's doctrine is in the apostles and in the Holy Scriptures." 3. Hundreds of Christians died before the New Testament was written. 4. Nor had many of them seen an apostle. 5. It would be mockery to make men's salvation depend upon faith in a "a catena of doctrine," without leaving them "a sure and certain authority by which those doctrines should be infallibly taught and expounded." 6. The apostolic commission is a permanent one.—Mat. xxviii. 19, 20. 7. The succession is taught in Eph. iv. 11—14. 8. The apostles ordained and commissioned Stephen, Philip, and Prochoras, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, and Paul, and Timothy, &c., with full power and authority to teach, &c. Therefore, "there must have been a Church with sole and plenary authority in all matters relating to doctrine and discipline."

Mr Baylee showed that there were several errors in those eight arguments. 1. It was not a catena of doctrine, but the *Gospel* which they were to believe, which, as far as concerned salvation, was simply trust in Jesus Christ as the gift of God's love for our sins, and so for our salvation. 2. That it was an error to allege the deacons as successors of the apostles, or to say that Paul was ordained by the apostles. That Mr Baylee's chief purpose in referring to that mistake was to show the inaccuracy with which the paper was drawn up, although it was put forward as the ground of so solemn a step as forsaking the Church of one's baptism. 3. That it was a very serious error to build any argument upon the time that the New Testament was written, inasmuch as the apostles took the Old Testament with them, and continually referred to it.

Mr B. reminded Lord —— how he had told him, nearly two years since, that Archdeacon Manning had fallen into the same error, and that it was pure Romanism. Mr B. took the opportunity of reminding Lord —— how often he had forewarned him that the Tractarians were really Romanists. This Lord —— acknowledged. Mr B. then said that therefore Lord —— could not say that he had read the Anglican side of the question, as he had only read Tractarian books.

The Bishop denied that the apostles ever employed the Old Testament, except when disputing with Jews; and called upon Mr B. for proof.

Mr B. referred to the numerous quotations from the Old Testament in Gentile epistles, and especially to Rom. xvi. 25, 26.—"The revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the Everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith."

Mr B. asserted that the apostles taught nothing that was not contained in the Old Testament, and proved from that passage that they took the Old Testament with them; and that, therefore, all the argument about the late composition of the New Testament fell to the ground.

The Bishop denied that all the dogmata of the Christian religion are contained in the Old Testament.

Mr B. referred to Acts xxvi. 22, 23.—"Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should

come: that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people and to the Gentiles."

Mr B. then called upon the bishop to name one dogma of the Christian religion not contained in the Old Testament.

After much hesitation, and being several times pressed to it, the bishop said, the Trinity was not in it, or at least very obscurely, and the Incarnation.

Mr B. referred to Isaiah xlviii, 16, and Isaiah ix. 6.

The Bishop said, "That does not bring conviction to my mind."

Mr B. replied, "It did to St Athanasius," and then appealed to Lord — which had the most Catholic mind—Mr B., who appealed to the Old Testament in proof of Christian dogmas, as did St Athanasius, and all the great fathers of the Church; or the bishop, who said that the very texts which satisfied them did not convince him.

The bishop was silent.

Mr B. then repeated the disproof of the argument that the authority of the Church must be above the Scriptures, because she existed previous to the Scriptures, inasmuch as the apostles took with them the Old Testament, and that the Jewish Church, which had certainly preceded the Old Testament Scriptures, was fallible, and fell.

The discussion then went on to the eleven heads taken by Mr B. out of Lord F.'s paper. 1. On what grounds is it asserted that St Peter was at the head of the first council of Jerusalem?

The Bishop said he had his own reasons for believing it founded on the supremacy of St Peter, but that the narrative itself would prove it, for that St Peter was the first to speak.

Mr Baylee alleged that St Peter did not speak until after there had been much disputing, (Acts xv. 7,) and that St James appears to have presided in the council, for he sums up, and says, "Wherefore my sentence is," &c. v. 19, &c. He added that the decree went forth in the name of the apostles, elders, and brethren, v. 23, and that in the 16th chap. v. 4, they are called "The decrees for to keep that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem."

The Bishop made no answer to this, and Mr B. reminded him and Lord — that this was the true view of the Catholic Church, the whole apostolate with the elders and brethren, and not the supremacy of one man, of which there is not a trace in the record of that council.

2. What ground is there for asserting that "the New Testament being merely a narrative of the history of the Church from its foundation, derives its authority as being the undoubted tradition of the Church founded by Christ?"

Mr B. showed that he had already proved that the apostolic teaching was founded upon the Old Testament, which was sufficient to show that the Scriptures were above the Church. He denied that the New Testament was received upon Church tradition, and called upon the Bishop to prove it. No attempt being made, we passed on to the third point.

3. Whether general councils may err? This was agreed to be referred to the general question of infallibility.

4. What authority is to decide when there are so many different opinions—Quakers, Socinians, Presbyterians, &c.? This also was referred to the general question of infallibility, except that Mr B. took the opportunity of showing the haste and inaccuracy with which the paper was drawn up, showing that Socinians do not accept the Bible and the Apostles' Creed, for they strenuously deny its inspiration, and that Presbyterians, (that is the Presbyterian confessions) do not deny "any peculiar inherent grace to the sacraments."

Mr B. read the following extract from a Swiss confession of 1566:—

"Christ is not absent from his Church celebrating his Holy Supper. The sun in heaven being distant from us is nevertheless present by his efficacy. How much more shall Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, who is bodily in heaven absent from us be spiritually present to us, by his life-giving virtue."

This passage seemed to produce a deep impression.

4. Whether infallibility is necessary for the propagation of the truth? Not argued, being referred to the general question which was to succeed the reading of the paper.

5. Was "feed my sheep," (John xxi. 15, 18,) an exclusive gift to Peter? Mr B. referred to Acts xx. 28, where St Paul exhorted the Ephesian elders to feed the Church of God, and to take heed to the flock over the which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers. Those elders did not derive their office from St Peter, but from St Paul, who had founded the Church of Ephesus, (Acts xix.) If, therefore, it was not an exclusive commission to St Peter, it could not prove his supremacy. The Bishop did not argue the point. Mr B. referred also to 1 Peter v. 2.

6. Is the power and headship of St Peter, as Bishop of Rome, evident from the teaching of the early Church and of the primitive Fathers? Mr B. called for one decree of the early Church on the subject. The Bishop declined to argue the point, saying he was not responsible for the paper.

7. Do St Ignatius, or St Irenæus, or Tertullian, testify to the supremacy of Rome? Mr B. called for a quotation. The Bishop said he was not a walking library. The point was therefore not argued, Mr B. asserting its erroneousness.

8. Did the Council of Nice assert the supremacy of Rome? Mr B. said that nobody who had the least pretensions to ecclesiastical knowledge could have asserted a thing so easily disproved by the history of that council, that there were two signatures to its acts before those of the legates of the Bishop of Rome.

The Bishop acknowledged the erroneousness of the assertion, and gave up the paper as inaccurate.

Mr Baylee then laid aside the paper, addressing himself to Lord —, and solemnly impressing upon him, that a paper which he declared to be the fruit of much study and prayer, was given up by the Bishop as untenable, and entreating him to remember that he had taken so solemn a step upon inaccuracies.

Lord — said he had other reasons besides those stated in the paper. Mr Baylee said, that surely his written ones, voluntarily put forward as his defence for deserting the Church of his baptism, must contain those reasons which had most convinced him, and that now he had heard the Roman Catholic Bishop give up his paper as untenable.

The other three questions, which were not argued, were:

9. Proof of Boniface's assertion that "From this fountain (the See of Rome) ecclesiastical discipline has flowed through all Churches."

10. What law of the Nicene Synod asserts that nothing is above the Pope?

11. Where does any father say that there could not be Catholic unity without one chief Bishop, the leader and organ of all?

This part of the discussion occupied about an hour. The Bishop gave up the paper as inaccurate, and said it was only "a waste of time to discuss it further, as he was not responsible for it"

In this Mr Baylee fully concurred, and requested the Bishop to proceed at once to the main point at issue—the infallibility claimed by the Church of Rome.

This is as nearly as I can recollect an accurate outline of our meeting up to this point.

Sept. 4, 1850.

JOSEPH BAYLEE.

Having given this memorandum of the first part of our conference, *so unaccountably passed over by you, I shall in my next letter proceed to give you account of the second and third parts of the controversy, accompanying it with my own memoranda of the same.*

An attentive perusal of the whole will not serve the cause of Romanism in the eyes of any lovers of truth and sincerity. It will reveal the means which are employed to uphold a system which cannot claim God as its author, truth for its attribute, nor Christ and his holiness for its end and object.

Earnestly praying that the publication of this controversy and of its attendant circumstances may save many unwary souls from mistaking Romanism for Catholic antiquity, and bring still more to rejoice in the pure Gospel of the grace of God in Christ,—I remain, Right Rev. Sir,

Your faithful Servant,

JOSEPH BAYLEE.

St Aidan's, Birkenhead, Nov. 21, 1850.

3.

The following very short letter of mine was forwarded to London by the Morning Mail of Monday, the 25th November, with a request to my correspondent there that it should be taken without loss of time to the office of the Morning Herald. I received an answer in course of post, saying, that the editor of the Herald would insert my letter "if there were space for it," in the paper of the following Thursday, the 28th inst. It was detained accordingly until that day. Mr Baylee was more fortunate; for, in the course of the same day, circumstances so favoured him as to allow of time and space sufficient for the composition, printing, correcting, and publishing of his answer of the 28th inst.; a letter, filling with small type two whole columns and a quarter of the Journal. It will be given below, and forms the last of his series.

To the Rev. JOSEPH BAYLEE,

Principal of St Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

Rev. Sir—Copies of the *Morning Herald* of the 18th and 23d inst. have been forwarded to me, in each of which I find a letter of yours referring to an interview, with the particulars of which you will forgive me for saying that I cannot yet deem myself at liberty, as a gentleman, to entertain the public. From your statement, indeed, it would appear that the respected individuals whose spokesman you were on the occasion, have no objection to its details being made subject of newspaper notoriety; but this circumstance does not relieve me from what I consider due to the feelings of others, whose religious doubts are at rest, whose names have already been more than sufficiently meddled with, and who have an evident claim on my discretion, until they request me to speak.

On receipt of your first letter I wrote to the noble Lord for whose soul you are solicitous, to draw his and Lady ——'s attention to the footing on which you have now thought fit to place the matter. When I receive their answer I shall know how far publicly to deal with your late contributions to the *Herald*.

Meanwhile, Rev. Sir, I must leave the course open for you to walk over as if treading undisputed ground, and shall only add, that the imputation you have thrown out against me, of having *privately circulated a printed account of our conference*, is one to which, in justice to myself, I am bound to give the most unqualified denial.

I am, Rev. Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

✠ JAMES GILLIS,

*Catholic Coadjutor Bishop of the
Eastern District in Scotland.*

Edinburgh, Nov. 25, 1850.

4.

Mr BAYLEE's last Letter, bearing date of the 28th Nov.

To the Right REV. DR GILLIS.

Right Rev. Sir,—There is a passage in St Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, which is of great importance to all who are brought into the unhappy antagonism of religious controversy. It is this—"Charity rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth."—1 Cor. xiii. 6. I felt the need of the admonition when I read your pamphlet, and saw the advantage which you had given me in giving such an account as you have done of our late conference. I felt it again when I read your letter in this morning's *Herald*. You have indeed given me an advantage in making such a statement as that with which you close your letter. You say "the imputation you have thrown out against me of having *privately circulated a printed account of our conference*, is one to which, in justice to myself, I am bound to give the most unqualified denial."

Now, Sir, what are the facts?

1. *You wrote and printed a pamphlet of 85 octavo pages, professing to give an account of all that passed in our conference.*

2. *You placed 50 copies of that pamphlet in the hands of one individual for circulation. How many more to others I have no means of ascertaining.*

3. *The pamphlet gave an unfaithful account of the conference, seriously to my disadvantage.*

4. *It was circulated as a triumphant refutation of Church of England principles.*

5. *I was informed of its circulation, and entreated to answer it, lest much injury should arise to the cause of Divine truth.*

Under circumstances such as these you venture to give the most unqualified denial of your having PRIVATELY circulated the pamphlet.

So then, if one man print a book, and give it to another to circulate, he is not guilty of its circulation! Accustomed, Sir, as I am, to the integrity of Protestant truth and the purity of English honour, I confess I feel it difficult to restrain the expression of honest indignation which such a departure from truth excites.

You say you are not "at liberty as a gentleman," to ENTERTAIN the public with the particulars of our interview," until you get permission from one of the parties interested in it. From what he has already written to me I do not anticipate any hindrance from him. But, Sir, how was it that your principles as a gentleman did not also induce you to obtain my permission? Was I not a party interested? Fifty printed copies might be read by thousands of

persons. They might even be reprinted, for, when once circulated, who was to limit their diffusion? I had no means of self-defence, except the straightforward course of printing your account and my own, and then to follow up the subject in subsequent letters.

By a kind letter from the noble lord to whom you refer, I find that I shall not "walk over the course" quite as undisturbed as you intimate. He offers me the choice of a Roman Catholic priest or a bishop to carry on the controversy with me. I have chosen the latter; and thus, by God's blessing, I shall have the opportunity of contrasting the doctrines of the Church of Rome with Catholic antiquity, and, above all, with God's holy Word.

And you, Sir, will not find it so easy to remain silent upon the moral question. In England one cannot altogether defy public opinion, and a credible charge of moral delinquency must be met and refuted, or else the delinquent must be content with the loss of all public respect and moral influence.

I write this, Sir, with real sorrow. We are both of us under very solemn responsibilities. Both of us have a large number of immortal souls who look to us for religious instruction and example. *We are dying men*, who are yet to stand at His judgment-seat who will bring every idle word into account, how much more the words of religious controversy! For myself, sir, my earnest prayer is, that I may not say one word in the course of this controversy for which I shall be sorry on that day.

I now proceed to fulfil my promise of comparing your pamphlet with my attested notes of the conference. Your pamphlet is entitled,—

"A REVIEW of the Subjects touched upon during a Controversial Conversation held at Edinburgh in presence of the Right Hon. the Earl of —, on the 29th of August, 1850. By the Right Rev. Bishop GILLIS. (Not published.) Edinburgh: 1850."

MY LORD,—I avail myself of my first opportunity of leisure to redeem the promise I made to your Lordship some weeks ago, of forwarding to you a statement of the doctrine taught by the Catholic Church on the several points of which mention was made in the course of my late controversial interview with your Lordship, Lady M —, and the Rev. Mr Baylee. I was the only one who on that occasion used neither pen nor pencil; but, on the breaking up of the conference, I took note, to the best of my recollection, of all that had passed, and submitted my jottings at the time to Lord —, who pronounced them to be correct. By these shall I now be guided.

The first point of Catholic belief challenged by Mr Baylee was the supremacy of St Peter, and his presidency over the apostolic council of Jerusalem.

I observed, that I believed in the supremacy of St Peter on other grounds than the mere narrative of that council by St Luke, and that being once satisfied as to the fact of that supremacy, the above narrative conveyed to me the clear conviction that St Peter had really presided over the council of the apostles, and ranked there before St James, the Bishop of Jerusalem.

On Mr Baylee referring for the contrary to the proceedings of the council, as recorded in the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, I remarked that it would be allowing him an unfair advantage to permit him to argue at all from the words of the Scripture, until he had proved it to be the Word of God, which I asserted it was impossible for him to do conclusively on any but Catholic grounds; and that I was hence entitled to ask him, as if I had been an infidel, to prove, in the first instance, the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures.

This Mr Baylee did not attempt to do, observing simply, that I could not refuse to admit the *historical* value of the narrative.

The conversation having now taken a desultory turn, in which reference was again made to the supremacy of St Peter, I insisted on our setting aside altogether the consideration of that question until we had first laid down the necessary groundwork of infallible authority in doctrinal teaching, Mr Baylee himself admitting that to be "the gist" of the whole argument; and because it would be time enough to inquire into the outward organ of said authority, when previously satisfied of the necessity of its existence.

I then proceeded to state that the truths and facts which form the basis of a Christian's belief being of such a nature that no amount of human learning, nor any process of human reason could ever lead to their discovery, they must, if known at all to man, have been revealed to him by the Almighty.

This much Mr Baylee readily granted.

I added,—now, as none of these truths or facts have ever been revealed by the Almighty *to me individually*, they can only become known to me through the evidence of some visible and audible witness, on whose testimony I must of necessity receive them.

To this second proposition Mr Baylee also assented.

But, I continued, ere such a witness can ever be to me a sufficient one, or, in other words, ere the evidence of this witness can be to me such as to exclude all possibility of doubt on the score of its testimony, I must have the assurance that such a witness neither can be deceived itself, nor deceive.

The last of these premises Mr Baylee did not deny.

Therefore, I concluded, ere I can admit as absolutely certain the truths and facts which form the groundwork of a Christian's faith, I must of necessity receive them on the teaching of an *infallible witness*.

This infallible witness, was to me, not a book, which can carry with it no authority, until I am satisfied that it is divinely inspired, faithfully translated, and that I understand its true sense; questions replete with difficulties for the most learned, and impossible of solution for nine-tenths of the human race; but a visible teaching Church, of whose infallible authority I become certain, on the same grounds on which I rest my faith in the divine nature of Christianity, viz.,—on the heavenly mission of the apostles, and on the legitimate succession of pastors who have inherited their commission; the former proved by the miracles of Christ and of the apostles themselves, their virtues, their martyrdom, and their success; the latter a matter of public notoriety, through the medium of ordination.

Although urged once and again to say *yes* or *no* to the conclusion I had drawn, as to the necessary existence of an infallible teaching authority in matters of Christian faith, ere anything like rational certainty can exist as to what a Christian is called upon to believe, Mr Baylee *cautiously abstained from any such positive reply*; but waived the difficulty by saying, "Allow me to speak, and I will answer that." I too leniently permitted him to take his own way; when, feeling himself freed from the inconvenient alternative, he proceeded as follows to argue from analogy.

Your argument, said he, is one of common sense, and therefore as good for a Jew as for a Christian. Now the Jews had *sufficient* means of knowing certainly the revelation which God had made to them; yet they have no *infallible means*. Hence your argument proves nothing.

As a whole, I positively denied the second of Mr Baylee's premises, and maintained, on the contrary, that the Jews *had infallible teaching*, viz., the revealed law of Moses, as borne witness to by the ordinary ministry of the Jewish Church, and by the extraordinary ministry of the prophets. Here again I unnecessarily relieved Mr Baylee, for the moment, from the burden of his argument; for having denied his premises, it was his business to prove it, not mine to prove the reverse.

Mr Baylee then undertook to make good his assertion, by referring to the first eight verses of the second chapter of Malachi, laying great stress on the

words, "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law from his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts. But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of Hosts. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law." From the above Mr Baylee inferred that the Jewish priesthood had corrupted the nature of the Mosaic revelation confided to their trust, the true interpretation of which ought to have been sought from their mouth.

Now, as I observed at the time, the above passage not only does not prove the correctness of Mr Baylee's assertion,—that the Jews were, in the days of Malachi, without *infallible* guidance in matters of faith; but it actually proves its untruth.

The only "covenant" for which infallible guidance could have been required among the Jews was the general Mosaic revelation, embracing the deposit of the promises and prophecies, the moral law, the ceremonial precepts, and the typical rites of religious worship. This, then, is *the* "covenant," which it rests with Mr Baylee to prove that the Jewish priesthood had corrupted in the days of Malachi. To prove anything short of this is to prove nothing to the purpose. Yet Mr Baylee's only proof of this in the above quotation are the words, "ye have corrupted *the* covenant." This is very like proving the obligation of keeping holy the *first* day of the week, by denominating it "*the Sabbath*;" and then, referring to the 5th of Deuteronomy, "Keep the Sabbath-day to sanctify it,"—the *Sabbath* of Deuteronomy being the seventh day of the week (our Saturday), and the Christian "*Sabbath*" being the first day of the week (our Sunday). So argues Mr Baylee. He takes violent possession of the word "*covenant*," and then gives to that word a totally different meaning from the sense which evidently belongs to it in the text of his own choosing.

When the prophet says that the people should "seek THE LAW at the mouth of the priest; or again, that the priests have by their conduct "caused many to stumble at THE LAW," he evidently speaks of the Mosaic revelation generally. But when he adds, "Ye have *corrupted the covenant*," he, in the first place, uses in Hebrew a mode of speech which the Septuagint has translated *disphileiarte*, and the Vulgate "irritum fecistis," "*to violate, to make void*;" while the word "covenant" applies no longer to the general revelation, but to the special pact which God had made with the sacerdotal house of Levi, and in virtue of which the children of Levi were to enjoy certain exclusive privileges, on condition of their fulfilling particular duties, and being bound by the observance of a peculiar code of disciplinary laws. Hence the prophet distinctly qualifies the word *covenant*, by calling it the "COVENANT OF LEVI." Indeed, this is made clear beyond the shadow of a doubt by the whole context of the prophecy; for, whereas the prophet's words from the beginning of the first chapter are addressed to the people of Israel generally:—"The burden of the word of the Lord *to Israel* by Malachi;" they are from the seventh verse of the same chapter restricted in a special manner *to the priests*; a circumstance emphatically insisted upon from the first verse of the second chapter. "And now, O ye PRIESTS, this commandment is for YOU;" and the only "*covenant*" mentioned in the following seven verses is that which the Almighty had entered into with the house of Levi, and which the Jewish priests are reproached by the prophet for having violated or made void, in as far as having neglected to fulfil THEIR part of it, they deserved that the Almighty should no longer be bound by HIS. They had done this, however, not by adulterating the revelation of Moses, but by swerving in their daily conduct from the example left to them by Levi; by departing from the fulfilment of the peculiar obligations binding upon them personally as priests, and through the scandal of their lives, causing many to fall away from the practice of what they knew to be their

duty, as the two sons of Eli had done before them in the days of Samuel (1st Samuel, chap. ii. ver. 27, &c.)

To have corrupted the general Mosaic revelation in the sense which Mr Baylee meant to convey by his inadmissible interpretation of the word "COVENANT," they must have added to or taken from the promises made; or falsified the prophecies; or adulterated the moral law; or suppressed or altered the nature of the typical rites and sacrifices—of which delinquencies the Jewish priesthood as a body can never be shown to have been guilty.

MEMORANDUM of the Discussion with Bishop GILLIS in Edinburgh.

(Part 2.)

Having laid aside Lord ——'s paper, we agreed to go to the general question—the infallibility of the Church.

Mr Baylee again reminded the Bishop that he was not discussing the authority of the Church, but the amount of that authority—whether it is infallible.

The Bishop commenced by saying that he would argue the question on infidel grounds; that the Scriptures were received on the authority of the Church, and, therefore, they were not to be alleged in proof or disproof of an authority to which they were subordinate.

Mr Baylee denied that the authority of the Scriptures was subordinate to the Church; but said that he was willing to waive the point, conceding to the Bishop the right of choosing his ground of defence. Mr Baylee observed that it was very strange that Roman Catholic ecclesiastics always took infidel grounds. If they really believed in the inspiration of the Scriptures, he could not see why the question should not be argued on scriptural grounds. He had no objection, however, to take the antagonism to infidelity, as the Bishop seemed so much to prefer the character of an infidel. He only reminded the Bishop that the question should not be shifted to other grounds until that one should be settled.

The Bishop then stated his argument thus:—The dogmata of religion can only be known by revelation—such as the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, &c. No one can be saved without the knowledge of them and faith in them. Revelation must be either immediate or mediate. None of us pretend to hold the truths of religion by immediate revelation. They are, therefore, received through a witness. In order to such a witness being a sufficient one, there must be no possibility of his being deceived, nor of his deceiving me. Therefore there must be an infallible Church to be the infallible witness to the dogmata of religion. Mr Baylee commenced by denying the absolute necessity of the knowledge of the doctrines of the revealed religion, or of faith in them, in order to salvation. The Bishop turned round to Lord —— with an exclamation of surprise at such a latitudinarian sentiment. Mr Baylee said that the Bishop himself held the same doctrine. The Bishop strenuously denied his doing so. Mr Baylee asked him whether he did not believe in the salvation of baptised infants who died in infancy? The Bishop acknowledged that he did; but that theirs was a peculiar case—that in their circumstances knowledge and faith are impossible. Mr Baylee answered that this admitted all that his argument required. It allowed that, under certain circumstances, there can be salvation without the knowledge of, much less faith in, the doctrines of Revelation. Consequently the Bishop must give up the doctrine of absolute necessity, and consequently it remained to be inquired into, what are the circumstances under which such necessity existed? and that therefore the argument for an infallible expositor from the necessity of the case fell to the ground. The Bishop gave no answer to this, so far as I can recollect. Mr Baylee then

stated his view of what is necessary to salvation. He stated that the removal of our guilt is alone by the cross of Christ, and (the removal) of our unfitness for heaven is alone by the spirit of Christ, and that God is not limited to any means by which he may apply those to any human being, and that therefore we cannot say of anything that is absolutely necessary as a means of salvation. The question, therefore, of the necessity of an infallible Church became one of circumstances, whether men are placed under such circumstances as to require an infallible expositor of Revelation.

As far as I recollect the Bishop made no objection to this statement, and we proceeded to the discussion to that view.

Mr Baylee said that arguing from necessity they could not limit themselves to the Christian dispensation, but must deal with man as a responsible being towards his Creator.

He therefore stated his argument thus :—1. Man's nature has remained the same in all ages of the world's history. 2. God's nature has not changed. 3. Man's responsibility as creature to Creator has not changed. 4. Man's salvability, as redeemed by a Redeemer has been at all times the same. Therefore, whatever necessity exists at this time for an infallible Church, must have always existed. But from Moses to Christ there was no infallible Church, and yet men were saved. Therefore there is no need of an infallible Church now.

The Bishop replied that the Jewish Church was infallible.

Mr Baylee replied that if so, an infallible Church denied and crucified the Son of God. He left the Bishop to draw the horrible inference that this would be respecting the truth of the mission of Christ. The Bishop answered that it was a subject of prophecy that the Jews should reject Christ, that their dispensation was a transitory one, and therefore not authoritative except for its own purposes ; that the types and shadows of the law passed away from the moment that our Saviour came, and therefore that as soon as he was on earth that Church ceased to be infallible, and so was permitted to crucify him in order to accomplish man's redemption ; but that before his coming the Jewish Church was infallible.

Mr Baylee denied that the law had passed away as soon as our Saviour came, and gave the following proofs :—1. Our Lord kept the Passover.—Luke xxii. 15. 2 The Apostles attended the Temple worship, and kept the law after the crucifixion.—Acts iii. 1, and xxi. 20—24. 3. Our Lord acknowledged the Mosaic authority of the Scribes and Pharisees.—Matt. xxiii. 2. There is, therefore, no ground for the attempted distinction between the last days of the Jewish Church and her previous history. Mr Baylee, however, said that he need not dwell on the point, as he could prove that she never was infallible.

The Bishop called for proofs. Mr Baylee referred to Mal. ii. 5—8—"My covenant was with him (Levi) of life and peace ; and I gave them to him for the fear wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before My name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips ; he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity. For the priests' lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts. But ye are departed out of the way, ye have caused many to stumble at the law ; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of Hosts." Again, in Jer. v. 30, 31. "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land. The prophets prophesy falsely ; and the priests bear rule by their means, and my people love to have it so ; and what will ye do in the end thereof?" The Bishop replied that those were not the Levitical priesthood and the appointed prophets, but the heathen ones, who turned away the Jews from the true religion. Mr Baylee referred to Jer. xxiii. 1, 4 ; and Ezek. xxxiv. 1, 6, and especially to verses. 16, 19. (See also Jer. xxiii, 11,—“For both prophet and priest are profane ; yea, in my house, have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord.”)

After some discussion of those passages, the Bishop acknowledged that the Jewish priests had corrupted their religion, but that the Lord had provided prophets as infallible expositors of his word.

Mr Baylee asserted that this was giving up the whole question.

By comparing these two statements, our readers will be able to judge of two things :—

1. *Of the character of your account of the conference.*

2. *Of the real nature of the evidence against the Roman theory.*

The latter is of permanent importance ; the former only concerns individual character.

He whose cause I plead will give me grace and strength to do it in simplicity and truth. *I write, sir, not to extol men or Churches, but to exalt my Saviour ; not to allure men to the false Church, which forgetteth the guide of her youth, and forsaketh the covenant of her God ; but to direct the perplexed and the weary to the truly infallible Guide, the ever blessed Spirit. May all my readers be “taught of the Lord” to realise that precious promise—“How much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?”*

I remain, Right Rev. Sir,

Your faithful Servant,

Nov. 28, 1850.

JOSEPH BAYLEE.

5.

The following Reply to the Rev. Mr Baylee's Letters was forwarded to the Editor of the “Morning Herald,” on the 17th of December.

To the REV. JOSEPH BAYLEE,
Principal of St Aidan's College,
Birkenhead.

REV. SIR,

Being now authorised to deal openly with Lord Feilding's name, in reference to the circumstances which attended the recent admission of his Lordship and Lady Feilding

into the Catholic Church, and about which you have felt *compelled* to exhibit so great solicitude in the columns of the "Morning Herald;" I beg to inform you, as well as all who may have been interested or edified by your contributions to that journal, that I in turn, have sent to press, for immediate publication, my "plain statement of facts," together with such correspondence regarding them, as may be likely to throw light, where light is needed; and that there with me the matter must finally rest. I have given my story and my arguments to the public, ungarnished with any seasoning of pious or patriotic phrase; as I am utterly at a loss to understand what the private act of any two individuals following out, in this free country, the dictates of their own conscience, can have to do with you and me being "dying men," or with that "aroused spirit of the English nation," on which you so courageously dilate, which is to convince the world whence arises "the mild tolerance of our laws; and read it a noble lesson, which elevates England's Church and nation to a pitch of glory never before attained by man."

All this imposing proem, which goes to elongate by one-fourth the legitimate proportions of your first letter to the Herald, may safely be left to the fate of the hollow pedestal on which you have thought fit to raise it. The "aura popularis" is not the unstable foundation on which the Catholic Church cares to build her greatness; nor is the gathering of even an English nobleman into her fold, (an occurrence, at any rate, now by no means rare,) to her an event of such unusual magnitude, as to require of her Bishops that they do necessarily set aside more pressing duties, to answer the call of every Anglican divine who may choose to think his own cause "the cause of Christ, his Saviour," and summon them in consequence to a controversy in the newspapers. The claims of "Rome" to the religious attention of the world are neither so few in number, nor so new in date, as to render "invaluable" to her any opportunity of publicity to which "the rank of the parties concerned" may be supposed to lend accidental importance. SHE has imparted lustre before now to many a noble name in this world; but the only increase of glory that can be shed upon her, must come down to her, Rev. Sir, from the world that is above. To men who believe this, the gracious offer of a borrowed ray from "the respectability" of the Morning Herald, is simply ludicrous. Having thus disposed of your preface and

allurements, I proceed, Rev. Sir, to such portions of your letters as seem to demand some brief notice here ; referring the public, for any apparent omission, to what may be read elsewhere concerning our conference.*

Firstly, then, Rev. Sir, you are evidently, from your own account, a martyr to *compulsion*. Any such open court as " the bar of public opinion " would clearly never have crossed your fancy, had I not forced you into evidence. " Recent events," say you, " some of which have obtained too painful a notoriety, *compel* me to address you through the public press"—" recent events " which have brought you and me into a connexion which the path you have marked out for yourself *compels* me to make " public."—(St Aidan's, Nov. 11.)

By " recent events," you mean, no doubt, the reception into the Catholic Church of Lord and Lady Feilding, and the subsequent interview between us, to which that reception led. This established the connexion which the path I have since marked out for myself *compels* you to make public ; while, by that path again, is implied the fact of my having forwarded to " the noble Earl, to whom you have the honour to be Chaplain," a printed, though not published, statement of what I had to say of that interview, rather than a written one. The act of *printing*, therefore, on my part, was, from your own showing, the *primary*, the *determining* cause of the compulsion to which you have since been obliged to yield. It might have been less impressive, but would have been more consistent, had you stopped here in stating the source of your grievance, instead of going on to prove that, apart altogether from any printing on my side, the aggression I had made upon your flock, would not, at any rate, have allowed you to remain silent. " It is not to be expected that we shall have aggressions made upon the flock of Christ committed to our care, *without standing forward* in their defence, and obeying the Apostolic injunction, to " earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." So earnest indeed were you, Rev. Sir, " to contend," that notwithstanding my repeated assurances to yourself that I could not, and would not, become your antagonist in any prolonged controversy ; you had so persuaded yourself, I suppose, that I either had, or ought to have spoken otherwise, that, as far back as the 25th of October last,

* See Facts and Correspondence relating to the admission into the Catholic Church of Viscount and Viscountess Feilding.

you had already grown too impatient of delay, to be able to bear with my silence any longer. Allow me to refresh your memory with the following quotation from a letter of yours to Lord Feilding of the date just mentioned—"I have kept this letter by me, hoping to have seen Bishop Gillis's *promised* paper.....You must not take it as any personal unkindness, if the interests of truth, and the public importance of the subject *compel* me to address Bishop Gillis through the public papers." Here, then, Rev. Sir, are your own words, to prove that at a time when you were necessarily ignorant of any intention on my part to print a single line, you already felt *compelled* "by the interests of truth, and the importance of the subject," to contend against me in "the public papers." In the name, therefore, and in the interests of truth, pray, forgive me for setting you right as to the real origin of your compulsion.

My reasons for having forwarded to the Earl of ——— the statement I had promised him in a printed, instead of a written form, will be found in my letter to that nobleman of the 2d November.* My answer to your expression of astonishment that I should have ventured on such a course, without giving you an opportunity of seeing whether my statement was a correct one, is simply this. In the first place, the statement I had promised, was not, as I have observed elsewhere, what you insist upon representing it,—an account of all that had been said during the three hours of our meeting; but a Catholic exposition of the subjects touched upon between you and me, during the two last hours of that meeting, and which alone formed the burden of our conference on the occasion. Secondly, I had promised that statement not to you, Rev. Sir, with whom I had unequivocally declined all correspondence upon the subject; but to the noble Earl whom you attended. And lastly, I must have acted like a simpleton, had I deemed it necessary to submit to *your* revisal, the correctness of what I had to state, as of Catholic belief, upon the questions discussed.

But that printed paper, you insist, was privately circulated by me. The justice of this charge I have already repudiated. You meekly reply, that said denial on my part is in itself "such a departure from truth," that it fills you to overflowing with "honest indignation," "accustomed as you are to the integrity of

* See Introduction to the publication already alluded to, "Facts and Correspondence," &c.

Protestant truth, and the purity of English honour." And your reason is, that I printed the book, and gave it to *Lord Feilding* to circulate. "So, if *one man* print a book, and give it to *another* to circulate, *he* is not guilty of its circulation!"

The demonstration, Rev. Sir, is not complimentary to Lord Feilding; but the truth is, you are not at present in a vein to be pleased with either of us; and that in order to have escaped your indignation, it is clear *I* must have abstained from writing the book itself. It needed, one would have thought, but little reflection to have shown you, that two simple manuscript copies of the "Review," and I could not have sent fewer, would have been just as open to the chances of eventual dissemination, as the fifty printed ones, of which you so feelingly complain. The complaint, however, about private printing, would have come from you with a better grace, had you not so long ago avowed your own determination to "address Bishop Gillis through the public papers." Nay, Lord Feilding will bear me out when I add, that on the very day on which his Lordship left Edinburgh, I strongly advocated the desirableness of there being printed *five* copies only, being one for each of the parties concerned, myself excluded; and that it was not till after further consideration on your already known threat of bringing the whole matter within the columns of the public journals, that I deemed it but fair Lord Feilding should be provided with more copies of a document, which could not have been reproduced, if called for, without an amount of expenditure it would have been somewhat Quixotic to have incurred, simply as a love offering to your exquisite sense of "the purity of English honour."

Your letter of the 23d November acquaints the public how we met on the 29th of August last, "at the Roman Catholic convent here," to discuss the merits of a paper written by Lord Feilding, and headed, "Reasons for Catholicity;" how "that paper was so weak, that a child could answer it;" and how you had gathered its contents into a memorandum which you now felt *compelled* to hand over for publication to the "Morning Herald;" and you say, addressing me,—"It is for you to account why your narrative of our conference makes no reference to that paper."

You were under a delusion, Rev. Sir, when you fancied yourself in a "convent"—We met at my own residence. With regard to Lord Feilding's "Reasons for Catholicity," as I have explained in my introduction to "Facts and Correspondence, &c.," from

whatever cause the misapprehension arose, I had so little understood the special object of our meeting to be the discussion of that paper, that I had not even once read it over. Had it been otherwise, however, I would have still considered that paper to remain what it was when written—the communication of a son to his father, under circumstances of the most solemn import to both, and, as such, claiming from me the respect due to a thing sacred ; not a peg on which, even in my own justification, to hang an article in the newspapers. This is the first ground on which I “account why my narrative of *our* conference makes no reference to that paper.” You, Rev. Sir, have thought differently, since you *published* the heads of that paper without having asked or obtained the permission of Lord Feilding : nay, accompanying it with the remark so very flattering to your “noble friend,” that it was “a paper so weak, that a child could answer it.” Continue, if you will, to hold by your own opinion in this, as in other matters on which we differ ; and as you seem to hesitate whether you shall say that you are going to “compare or to contrast” our accounts of an interview to which you are evidently bent on conferring fame, you had better, perhaps, in all future editions, at once decide upon the adoption of the latter word.

You charge me, again, with having suppressed a vast deal of what you had said connected with the above paper, because the only question arising out of it, to which I have given in my “Review” a general and passing notice, viz. the supremacy of St Peter ; is there spoken of as “the first point of Catholic belief” contested by you. But you surely forget that I never promised to the Earl of ——— to forward to his Lordship any statement concerning that paper, or your remarks upon it ; nay, you yourself have recorded the contrary. If, then, in my Review I made mention at all of “the supremacy of St Peter as of the first point of Catholic belief challenged by you,” I did so, without reference to its forming any part of Lord Feilding’s paper first or last ; but, as the first subject on which any discussion can be said to have taken place between us, and as what first led to the main argument of the conference, which at this juncture only began, in as far as I was concerned ; viz. the necessity of an infallible witness to the truths of divine revelation. Had I undertaken the office of acting as your reporter on the occasion, I would not, at any rate, have included, as you have done, apparently in the most natural and logical order, within your strictures on Lord Feilding’s paper and the matter alluded to during

the *first* hour of the meeting, your reference to St Athanasius and the Trinity, and your quotation from the Swiss Confession, which you say "seemed to produce a deep impression." Your own paper on infallibility proves that the former did not come to be mentioned, until towards the close of the argument on the necessity of infallible teaching, or, during the *third* hour of the meeting; while the latter was produced still later, when the conversation had turned in a special manner upon the Eucharist, and when you had taken occasion to explain your own view of the real presence, as implying "a mystical presence in which the true body of our Lord affected your soul for good." The way in which you have interwoven both with the subjects which you say were treated of during the first hour, and that without breaking the thread of your argument, affords the most unanswerable evidence that you must have sadly confused your notes, ere you put into shape your second letter to the Herald.

As to the antiquated wail you have raised about the "idolatries" of Rome, and your charge of "sacrilegious profanation of the holy ordinance of baptism," all I have to remark is, that while the one may chime in, perhaps, opportunely enough with the present discordant outcry against papal enormities, and the sudden revival amongst us of a great deal which most men had been led to think obsolete; it will be time enough to answer the other, when the Church of which you are a minister, can make up its mind to define what "the holy ordinance of baptism" really is.

Having now, Rev. Sir, briefly noticed the different passages in your communications to the Herald, which seemed to me to call for remark, I am willing to leave the result in the hands of the public; since, as you have given us to understand, your three letters to that paper, have brought your labours to a close. You have politely told me that I had made you say what you *had not* said; that I had omitted to state what you *did* say; that I have said many things in my pamphlet which I had *not said* in conversation; while, again, I had passed over in silence many things which I *had* said. Be it so; your three letters to the Herald, which profess to be complete in their information, have of course put all this right; and, as they shall be published entire, along with your paper on Infallibility, and my "Review," all impartial readers will have the fullest opportunity of judging for themselves. Meanwhile, I take the liberty of reminding you, that while my pamphlet was written simply as a Catholic exposition of the subjects touched upon between us during the *last two*

hours of our meeting ; your letters, purporting to be a complete account of all that passed during *these last two* hours, as well as during the *first*, (and now an *opus absolutum*,) are not a little remarkable in the following particulars : 1st, They promise a comparison or contrast, “in parallel columns” between your “memoranda,” and my “review ;” and while they state that the latter extended to a pamphlet of *eighty five* octavo pages ; they reproduce of these eighty-five pages, just *six* ! 2nd, My six pages are, in as far as they go, a *refutation* of what you had previously stated. Your letters contain *no rejoinder* ; they are simply an unvindicated repetition of what you had said before. 3rd, Of the following subjects which occupied a considerable portion of the *last* hour of our conference, viz :

The argument on the Eucharist, and the confident assertion on your part, that there existed no trace in the Liturgies of the 5th century, of the elevation of the Host after consecration, a point which you declared you considered of great importance in the controversy.

Your resolute denial of the book of Common Prayer having been taken from the Roman Missal.

Your reverential objection to the doctrine and practice of the Invocation of Saints.

Your imputation of *perjury* to every Catholic venturing to put a definite sense of any kind on a text of Scripture, after having once adhered to the Profession of Catholic Faith, called the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

Your readiness to prove that the Council of Trent had anathematized St Augustine—of all this “important matter,” as well as of some other subjects that might be added, such as your unorthodox leaning to the principle of the Society of Friends, and your innocent astonishment and good resolves on the matter of eating game, &c., of all this, your three faultless letters, your complete account of our conference, say simply *nothing*.

One word more, Rev. Sir, and I have done. Albeit, “you write not to exalt men, or Churches, but Christ your Saviour,” yet, you have significantly noted by the way, that on the evening of the day of our conference, Lord Feilding acknowledged to you, that “you had the best of the argument, but attributed it to my ill-health, and not being accustomed to oral controversy”—on which you with becoming modesty replied, that “you did not wish to claim any victory in an *extempore* controversy.”

Whatever you may have understood Lord Feilding to have ac-

knowned, on the evening of the day mentioned, this much at least I can vouch for, that before that day closed, I had laid before his Lordship such indisputable evidence of the recklessness of your very fluent assertions, at a moment when the necessary documents were wanting to demonstrate their hollowness, that I left him if possible more strengthened than before, in his conviction of Catholic Truth. The very terms, indeed, in which you here express yourself show, that this conviction was already far too strong in Lord Feilding, to have been shaken by any arguments of yours; or, why allude to my ill health, or want of habit in oral controversy, to account for any fancied advantage on your part, to which it is not likely he would have been the first to awaken your attention. It is time enough to be modest in victory, when victory is won; and *it is so* in controversy, when you have carried conviction to the party you seek to convince. Meanwhile, Rev. Sir, Lord Feilding remains a Catholic, as must appear from the following written acknowledgments, the originals of which I am ready, if called upon, to produce.

Our meeting had taken place on the 29th of August; on the 8th of Sept., Lord Feilding having received, and read your paper on infallibility, forwarded it to me. The impression it had made upon his Lordship, may be gathered from the following short, but decisive extract from the letter that enclosed it. "I shall write to Mr Baylee by this post, to tell him honestly that I do not consent to this discussion for *my own* satisfaction." The italics are Lord Feilding's. On the 5th of November, his Lordship having received and read my "Review, &c." wrote thus, from Downing: "I have read the "Review," and think you have "crushed Mr Baylee's arguments to powder." In a letter of the 25th November, Lord Feilding says: "Of course your Lordship may make public any expressions of satisfaction at the correctness of the report of the conversation as given in your pamphlet; and Mr Baylee's *précis* which he sent to me at first, and I committed to you, is of course public property. Do you not think it would be well now to offer your pamphlet to ——— to *publish*, that the public may judge between you?"—Finally, the following letter from Lord Feilding, written for the express purpose of being published, I give, of course in full.

"London, Nov. 30, 1850.

"MY DEAR LORD,

"I am very glad you are going to publish the paper which was sent to me, immediately after the conference, by Mr Baylee, and

which professes to give succinctly *all the main arguments* used by him on the occasion. When compared with your pamphlet, I think it will be found that there is not so much discrepancy, as regards the *course* of argument, as Mr Baylee, in his published letters in the "Morning Herald," would have the public to imagine exists in your two respective accounts of it.

"Your pamphlet never professed to do more than to overthrow the *main* arguments upon which Mr Baylee seemed to rely. All other matter was, in comparison, immaterial; and a great deal was waived as such, by mutual consent. I am certainly not aware that your Lordship has omitted any argument of importance *urged by Mr Baylee as such at the time*; nor do I think you have stated anything incorrectly. Had I thought so, I should have informed your Lordship before the pamphlet was printed.

"Mr Baylee must *overthrow* your premises showing the necessity of the existence of some infallible authority in matters of faith, (which to my mind are most powerful,) ere he can hope to persuade any candid thinking mind that the Protestant communion established in England, is right in ignoring any such authority. You have, to my mind, most completely overthrown every proposition of his which you have as yet handled.

"Praying that the God of all truth may cause His light to shine through you, into many hearts now clouded by ignorance and prejudice,

"I remain, my dear Lord,

"Yours faithfully in J. C.

"FEILDING."

The above, Rev. Sir, would have been forwarded sooner, but for my accumulated duties at this particular season; and I have now only to repeat, that, in as far as regards myself, here our correspondence must terminate.

I have the honour to be, Rev. Sir,

Your most obedient Servant in Christ,

✠ JAMES GILLIS,

*Coadjutor Catholic Bishop of the
Eastern District in Scotland.*

Edinburgh, 16th December 1850.

To the REV. JOSEPH BAYLEE, &c. &c.

POSTSCRIPT.

The manuscript copy of the foregoing letter was forwarded to my London publisher, Mr Dolman, on the 17th inst., with a request that he would see it inserted without delay in the columns of the Morning Herald. Yesterday, the 20th, I received from Mr Dolman the following communication.

December 19, 1850.

MY LORD,

The enclosed has just come to hand ; I forward it to show I have done all that depended on me. The publication of the pamphlet, therefore, need not be delayed, and Mr Marsh had better send up a supply instanter to London, to be here speedily.

I have the honor to be, MY LORD,

Respectfully,

Your Lordship's obedient Servant,

CHARLES DOLMAN.

RIGHT REV. DR GILLIS.

Morning Herald Office, December 18, 1850.

The Editor of the Morning Herald presents his compliments to Mr Dolman, and begs to inform him that the letter of Dr Gillis to Mr Baylee shall appear at the *earliest moment*, possibly to-morrow, *more probably* on Saturday.

In pursuance of Mr Dolman's Letter, the preceding pamphlet, "Facts and Correspondence," &c. was immediately published in Edinburgh, by Messrs Marsh & Beattie, and would have been forwarded to London by the Evening Mail, but for an accidental omission of the title page of the "Review."

This morning, (the 21st inst.,) I received from the Editor of the Morning Herald, the following note.

Morning Herald Office,
London, 19th December, 1850.

RIGHT REV. SIR,

I have received through your Publisher, a letter in reply to a series of letters addressed to you by the Rev. Mr Baylee, through the columns of the Morning Herald. I have read that document, and withhold the publication of it until I shall be favoured with a reply to this note.

You seem by the current of your remarks on Mr Baylee's letters, only to have received *three* papers containing those documents, whereas seven of those letters have been already published, several of them containing promises of continuation, and one of them declaring distinctly, that the whole of your remarks should appear. I have now two more unpublished letters of Mr Baylee, which will complete the series, and in which your "Remarks," and his annotations, will be concluded.

As I feel assured you would wish to be set right on this point, and to be held guiltless of a mis-statement, I therefore hold your letter, until you desire that it shall be published, with any amendment you deem needful; and I

have desired our publisher, if possible, to procure and to (forward ?) to you, copies of the Herald which contain those letters ; and I shall personally take care that copies of the next two letters shall be sent through the post.

Believe me,

RIGHT REV. SIR,

Your obedient Servant,

ROBERT KNOX,

Editor of the Herald.

RIGHT REV. DR GILLIS, &c.

As I have already hinted, (3. page 120,) I am decidedly unfortunate in my endeavours to avail myself of " the kindness of the Editor of the LONDON MORNING HERALD, the columns of whose valuable journal were to be opened to this controversy." Notwithstanding that gentleman's note of the 18th inst. to Mr Dolman, my letter of the 16th is obligingly withheld from publication, until I shall have explained to the public why I have only noticed *three* of Mr Baylee's letters ; whereas Mr Baylee, it seems, has already published *seven* letters upon the subject of our Conference, and still has two more in reserve. My apology is the following.—Firstly, I never heard of Mr Baylee's *four* last letters till I received, this morning, the above information from the Editor of the MORNING HERALD.—Why was I never favoured with a copy of them ?—Secondly, although at first under the impression, as the opening line of my Introduction will show, that Mr Baylee intended to write more than *three* letters, yet the fact of no more being forwarded to me, and my consequent ignorance of the existence of any more, together with a careful and repeated perusal of the concluding portions of Mr Baylee's second and third letters, certainly forced upon me the conviction, that, however apparently imperfect his labours, they had, nevertheless, reached their close.

I now appeal to any candid mind whether Mr Baylee's own words did not naturally warrant this conclusion. At the end of his second letter, Mr Baylee says :—" This part of the discussion " occupied about an hour..... This is, as nearly as I can re- " collect, an accurate outline of our meeting up to this point..... " Having given this memorandum of the *first part* of our confer- " ence, so unaccountably passed over by you, I shall in my next " letter proceed to give an account of the *second and third part* " of the controversy, accompanying it with my own memoranda " of the same. *An attentive perusal of the whole* will not serve " the cause of Romanism in the eyes of any lovers of truth and " sincerity." Mr Baylee's third letter ends thus :—" *By compar-* " *ing these two statements*, our readers will be able to judge of " two things. 1. Of the character of your account of the Confer-

“ence. 2. Of the real nature of the evidence against the Roman theory. The latter is of permanent importance; the former only concerns individual character.”

How could any reader be enabled to judge of the above from a comparison of *these two statements*, unless both were supposed to contain all that was intended to be stated?—If Mr Baylee meant to convey by these words, that he had six more letters to write, he might have expressed himself, one would think, in a manner somewhat less open to misapprehension. Whatever number of letters, however, Mr Baylee, may have written, *I* shall certainly not pledge myself to answer them, after what I have here given to the public; having already sacrificed to that Gentleman's fierce love of controversy more of my time than he was at all entitled to, after my reiterated refusals to enter with him into controversy at all. If we Catholic Bishops had to write as much as I have already written, for every member of the Anglican Communion applying now a-days for reconciliation with the Holy See, we would be wasting leisure which experience teaches us may be more usefully employed, in gathering into the fold of the Catholic Church those who really seek to enter it.

✠ J. G.

Edinburgh, 21st December, 1850.

402037



